Light on the Path

Talks given from 03/12/85 am to 13/02/86 am
English Discourse series
38 Chapters
Year published: 1988
Originally titled "The Rajneesh Bible Volume 9".

Light on the Path
Chapter #1
Chapter title: Be unpredictable
3 December 1985 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
YOUR SANNYASINS AND LOVERS ALL AROUND ARE CONCERNED ABOUT YOUR HEALTH. HOW ARE YOU NOW?

My health is good. They tried to harm me but they could not succeed for two reasons: one, the people they had appointed to harass me -- to indirectly create situations in which I would be suffering -- soon fell in love with me. They started saying to me, "This is something we cannot do."
In one jail particularly, the sheriff of the jail, the doctor, the nurses and all the inmates -- three hundred and sixty people... it almost became a commune. For six days I was there, and it changed the whole atmosphere of the jail.

The sheriff was an old man and he told me, "This is for the first time, and perhaps the last time, that a person like you will come into this jail. We have never felt so silent; even our criminals have never been so peaceful. And our whole staff has fallen in such love with you that they don't want you to be released. They want you to be here."
The head nurse said, "Tomorrow, we will be looking for you and we will miss you." People are people. If you just have enough love, you can change their hearts very easily. So this was one of the reasons they could not harm me much.
The second reason was the freedom, the immense freedom of the press. The whole world press, except India, was focused on me. Every jail where I was, was puzzled about what has happened. Twenty-four hours a day there were telephone calls, thousands of telegrams, hundreds of flowers reaching from all parts of the world. "If so many people love this man, there must have been some mistake." And the press was continuously around every jail -- in their helicopters with their cameras, cameras on the gate, cameras in the trees. They never left me for a single moment in twelve days. And just in my passing from one jail to another -- at least I had to come out of the gate -- even in those few moments they would ask me, "Are they harming you? Just one word from you and the whole world will see the real fascist face of America." Afraid of the press, they could not do much.
So my health is perfectly good.

Question 2
BELOVED OSHO,

WHAT IS THE BEST WAY TO ENCOURAGE PEOPLE IN MEDITATION?

The first thing: for a patient to go to the doctor, you must make him realize that he is sick; otherwise there is no need to go to the doctor.

So the people you want to encourage into meditation: first you have to make them aware that they are frustrated, perhaps for so long that they have forgotten that they are sad. They cannot remember when they laughed from their very hearts. They have become robots -- they do things because they have to be done but there is no joy in doing them.

They are living an accidental life. Their birth is accidental, their marriage is accidental, their children are accidental, their job is accidental. Their life has no sense of intrinsic growth and direction. That's why they cannot feel like rejoicing.

So first you have to make them aware where they are -- and almost everybody is in the same situation. Death is coming close -- you cannot even rely on your being here tomorrow. And your life is an absolute desert -- it has not found any oasis, it has not felt any meaning, any significance -- and death may destroy all possibilities in the future.

So first you have to make them aware of their meaningless, accidental, frustrated life. They know it, but they try to suppress their knowing in many ways, because to know it continuously is a torture. So they go to the movies to forget it. They go to parties, they go to picnics, they drink alcoholic beverages; they do everything -- just to somehow

not remember the reality of their life, their hollowness, futility.

This is the most important part -- to remind them. And once a person remembers all this, then to lead him towards meditation is a very simple thing, because meditation is the only answer to all the questions of man. It may be frustration, it may be depression, it may be sadness, it may be meaninglessness, it may be anguish: The problems may be many but the answer is one.

Meditation is the answer.

And the simplest method of meditation is just a way of witnessing. There are one hundred and twelve methods of meditation, but witnessing is an essential part of all one hundred and twelve methods. So as far as I am concerned, witnessing is the only method. Those one hundred and twelve are different applications of witnessing.

The essential core, the spirit of meditation is to learn how to witness.

You are seeing a tree: You are there, the tree is there, but can't you find one thing more? -- that you are seeing the tree, that there is a witness in you which is seeing you seeing the tree.

The world is not divided only into the object and the subject. There is also something beyond both, and that beyond is meditation.

So in every act... and I don't want people to sit for one hour or half an hour in the morning or in the evening. That kind of meditation is not going to help, because if you meditate for one hour, then for twenty-three hours you will be doing just the opposite of it.

Meditation can be victorious: witnessing is such a method that it can spread over twenty-four hours of your day. Eating, don't get identified with the eater. The food is there, the eater is there, and you are here, watching. Walking, let the body walk but you simply watch. Slowly, the knack comes. It is a knack, and once you can watch small things....

This crow, crowing... you are listening. These are two -- object and subject. But can't you see a witness who is seeing both? -- The crow, the listener, and still there is someone who is watching both. It is such a simple phenomenon. Then you can move into deeper layers: you can watch your thoughts; you can watch your emotions, your moods.

There is no need to say, "I am sad." The fact is that you are a witness that a cloud of sadness is passing over you. There is anger -- you can simply be a witness. There is no need to say, "I am angry." You are never angry -- there is no way for you to be angry -- you are always a witness. The anger comes and goes; you are just a mirror. Things come, get reflected, move -- and the mirror remains empty and clean, unscratched by the reflections.

Witnessing is finding your inside mirror.

And once you have found it, miracles start happening. When you are simply witnessing the thoughts, thoughts disappear. Then there is suddenly a tremendous silence you have never known. When you are watching the moods -- anger, sadness, happiness -- they suddenly disappear and an even greater silence is experienced.

And when there is nothing to watch -- then the revolution. Then the witnessing energy turns upon itself because there

is nothing to prevent it; there is no object left. The word "object" is beautiful. It simply means that which prevents you, objects you. When there is no object to your witnessing, it simply comes around back to yourself -- to the source. And this is the point where one becomes enlightened.

Meditation is only a path: the end is always buddhahood, enlightenment. And to know this moment is to know all. Then there is no misery, no frustration, no meaninglessness; then life is no longer an accident. It becomes part of this cosmic whole -- an essential part. And a tremendous bliss arises that this whole existence needs you.

Man's greatest need is to be needed. If somebody needs you, you feel gratified. But if the whole existence needs you, then there is no limit to your bliss. And this existence needs even a small blade of grass as much as the biggest star.

There is no question of inequality. Nobody can substitute for you. If you are not there, then existence will be something less and will remain always something less -- it will never be full. That feeling -- that this whole immense existence is in need of you -- takes all miseries away from you.

For the first time, you have come home.

Question 3

BELOVED OSHO,

WHAT KIND OF MEDITATION DO YOU SUGGEST FOR THE PEOPLE FOR WHOM DYNAMIC

MEDITATION IS NOT SUITABLE DUE TO MEDICAL REASONS?

I have answered that.

Question 4
BELOVED OSHO,
CAN YOU GIVE YOUR REASONS FOR THE NEED OF COORDINATORS?

Whenever there is more than one person, there is always a possibility of conflict, a possibility of disagreement, a possibility of a rift.
And sannyas is a movement.
Christianity does not need coordinators because it is not a movement. It is not alive, it is dead like all other religions. It has fixed roots. Either you follow or you don't follow; there is no question of agreement or disagreement. You cannot disagree with Jesus Christ. Either you have faith or you don't.
But sannyas is not a dead, fixed dogma. It is an on-going process, a movement where I do not support faith, I do not support belief. I support reasoning, intelligence; I support doubt.
Naturally, coordinators are needed, because if twelve persons are there in an ashram or five thousand people in a commune, on each and every point there can be disagreement. The function of the coordinator is not to enforce a certain dogma but to bring every possible argument into the open.

Everybody has to be invited to bring his own opinion and then sort it out and unanimously decide what comes closer to truth. The coordinator is simply to make this arrangement so that people can come together with reasoning, not with belief, with their intelligence not crushed but enhanced. I would not like my sannyasins to be just believers.

One of the chaplains came to me in a jail in America. He must have been coming every Sunday to visit the jail, and he must have heard my name. He particularly came to me to give me a BIBLE. I said, "What is this?"

He said, "This is the word of God."

I said, "How did you come to know that this is the word of God? Has God told you?"

"No," he said, "it is written in THE BIBLE itself."

I said, "But it is also written in the KORAN, it is also written in the VEDAS, it is also written in the GITA. Then how are you going to choose which is the true word of God? They all claim that these are the words of God."

I said, "I will keep it -- you have brought it with such love -- but remember, this is not the word of God. And have you looked into the book? You are a chaplain; you must have studied it your whole life, passed examinations in theological colleges. Have you ever thought that at least five hundred pages in THE BIBLE are pornographic? Your God seems to be a pornographer."

He said, "Pornography? "

I said, "You can open the book anywhere and you will find pornography and nothing else. And it is not only the case with you; it is the case with Hindus, with Mohammedans, with Jews, with everybody. Their so-called holy books are

so unholy, but nobody looks into it. With faith, one goes on believing."
The chaplain was a little puzzled. He said, "I will have to look into it again."
I said, "You will have to look, but you will have to look not with faith, because faith is blindness. You will have to look with a reasoning intelligence. Jesus proclaiming himself the only begotten son of God.... Now, if you come across somebody in the street proclaiming that he is the only begotten son of God, what are you going to think about the man?"
He said, "I will think he is mad."
I said, "Then why are you thinking differently about Jesus? In Jesus' life not a single rabbi, not a single scholar, not a single man of intelligence, of the intelligentsia, ever became his disciple. The twelve people that became his apostles were fishermen, woodcutters, farmers, shoemakers -- or the lowest class, uneducated.
"Just visualize a man sitting on a donkey. Jesus used to sit on a donkey -- riding donkeys was prevalent in Judea -- followed by twelve uneducated people, proclaiming himself the only begotten son of God." The chaplain said, "Just stop! You can destroy my faith. Now this idea of Jesus sitting on a donkey, followed by twelve uneducated people -- it will take years for me to get rid of it."
The function of the coordinator is to help people to be more intelligent about any problem, to be more rational; and secondly, to make them aware that it is not a question of their being right or your being right. The question is: what is truth? Truth belongs to nobody, and we are all seekers.

The function of the coordinator is very important. He should be very humble; only then can he do this work. He should not be authoritative in any way, because if he himself is authoritative, then how is he going to help people to grow in intelligence?

Question 5
BELOVED OSHO,
HOW CAN WE AVOID BEING AUTHORITATIVE?

It is very simple.
The people who are authoritarian are the people who are suffering from an inferiority complex.
To hide their inferiority they impose their superiority. They want to prove that they are somebody, that their word is truth, that their word is law. But deep down they are very inferior beings.
This is one of the reasons that all of the politicians suffer from an inferiority complex. Anybody who does not suffer from an inferiority complex will not go into politics at all. There are so many beautiful things in the world to do -- to paint, to sing, to dance, to create literature, to make beautiful statues, to create a Khajuraho. There is so much creativity available, but that is available only to a person who does not suffer from inferiority.
So we have to make clear to all our sannyasins that nobody in the world is inferior and nobody in the world is superior. The whole idea is artificial and created by people who have a vested interest in it. They have created the same idea in many ways... man is superior, woman is inferior -- on what criterion?

The woman lives longer than man, five years longer. The woman falls sick less than man. For one hundred boys born, only ninety girls are born, because by the time the boys will be marriageable, ten will have gone down the drain.

At the time of marriage they will be equal, ninety of both. The girl has more stamina, more resistance to disease. She talks about committing suicide but she never does. Men commit suicide almost twice as much as women.

In what way is man superior? But the idea had to be created because it helped man to keep woman a slave.

She is inferior, so inferior that in countries like China, woman has no soul. A husband can kill his wife -- it is not a crime. It is just like you destroy your chair. It is your chair, you have paid for it: what crime is there? And men have convinced women that they don't have any soul because they never allowed them to be educated, they never allowed them to move in society. Naturally, they could not argue.

Why is it so difficult to argue with a woman? Nobody thinks about it. If you argue with a woman she will start screaming, crying, throwing things; but she will not argue. And you, seeing this whole scene, will feel it is better to accept whatever she is saying; otherwise she will put the whole house on fire. And neighbors are watching, people in the street are gathering around your house. So it is better -- whether you are right or wrong does not matter -- to say she is right.

But who has put her in this condition? It is because you never gave her education, you never taught her logic. You never allowed her to be as intelligent as you are because

you were always afraid. And you can see the fear in the universities. Women are always ahead of men, they top the list more than men. They always achieve more first class honors than the man.

We have created this idea of superiority and inferiority for some vested interests.

The sudras are inferior. Nobody has proved why. There seems to be no reason that the brahmin should be superior and the sudra should be inferior, but you have managed for thousands of years to keep them uneducated. You have kept them doing things which need no intelligence, and you have not allowed them to do anything else.

A man who has been making your shoes -- his family has been making shoes for thousands of years, generation after generation. Now there is no need of intelligence. There is no challenge -- he has only to make shoes. These are all strategies of exploitation.

We have to explain to our sannyasins that nobody is superior, nobody is inferior, and nobody is equal either. Everybody is unique. That point has to be remembered, because if you say nobody is superior and nobody is inferior, people are certain to conclude that everybody is equal -- which is not true.

Equality is psychologically wrong. Everybody cannot be an Albert Einstein and everybody cannot be a Rabindranath Tagore. But that does not mean that Rabindranath Tagore is superior because you cannot be him. Rabindranath cannot be you either.

My whole point is that everybody is a unique manifestation. So we destroy the whole idea of superiority

and inferiority, equality and inequality, and we replace it with a new concept of uniqueness.
And every individual is unique.
Just look lovingly and you will see that every individual has something which nobody else has. Once the idea of uniqueness spreads in the commune, there will be nobody who will try to enforce authority.

Question 6
BELOVED OSHO,
WHAT IS THE FUTURE OF THE COMMUNES?

I don't think much about the future because the future is born of the present. If we can take care of the present, we have taken care of the future. It is not going to come from nowhere, it is going to grow from this moment. The next moment will be growing out of this moment. If this moment is beautiful, silent, blissful, the next moment is bound to be more silent, more blissful.
Now there are communes all over the world, and they are rejoicing in the present. Naturally, whatever comes in the future will be better. I don't believe in the idea that has been enforced in India for centuries -- that the golden age has passed: that it was in satyuga, the age of truth, and then the fall began and we are now at the last stage of the fall, kaliyuga.
This is one of the reasons that Indian psychology is depressive and does not have the inspiration to grow, to expand, to be rich, to be creative. For what? -- in Kaliyuga it is not possible. If you are sad, if you are frustrated, if you are miserable, that's how you should be. It fits with the

Hindu idea of a continuous fall -- and that is absolutely absurd.
I trust in evolution.
The golden age is always in the future.

Question 7
BELOVED OSHO,
YOU ARE AN EVER-CHANGING, UNPREDICTABLE MASTER -- HOW CAN WE BE YOUR CONTEMPORARY FELLOW TRAVELERS?

In the same way! Be unpredictable and be ever-changing. Never stop changing and never stop being unpredictable, and only then can life be a joy.
The moment you become predictable, you become a machine. A machine is predictable. It was the same yesterday, it is the same today, it will be the same tomorrow. You can predict about it: it is unchanging. It is only man's prerogative to be changing every moment.
The day you stop changing, in a subtle way you have died. And many people in the world die nearabout the age of thirty. Then they go on living -- perhaps forty years, forty-five years more -- but that is posthumous living, it is not really living. They have stopped living at thirty. But there is no need to stop living until the breathing itself stops.
In the first world war it happened that for the first time they checked the mental age of the soldiers, and they were surprised: the average mental age was only thirteen years. The person may have been forty, fifty -- his mental age was thirteen. He had stopped growing mentally at thirteen, although his body went on growing.

I would like that your.... If this is possible, that the body can be fifty, and the mental age can be thirteen, why is it not possible that your body is fifty and your mental age is two hundred? It is exactly the same thing. One just has to risk losing stability, guarantees, because wherever you are, things are guaranteed, stable, and you think, "Why take any risk in changing?"

No. Risks should be one of the basic foundations of a real man. The moment you see that things are settling, unsettle them.

I have been doing that my whole life. I have never settled myself, neither have I allowed anybody else to settle. And I feel that this is the way to grow. Each moment, something new blossoms in you. At the very last moment....

I am reminded of a Zen master who said to his disciples, "My time of death has come, but I am a little puzzled: I am trying to think of some way to die in which nobody else has died before, because I don't want to be an imitator. You suggest something."

Somebody said, "It will be good if you die standing."

But one man said, "I have heard one Zen master once died standing." -- so that was ruled out.

Dying, lying in the bed, was of course absolutely ruled out. Ninety-nine percent of people die in their bed, lying down. That is the most dangerous place -- your bed. That is where ninety-nine percent of people down through thousands of years have been dying. It is better to pull your mattress onto the floor.

The Zen master said, "I have got an idea! If a man has died standing, then I will die standing on my head. Have you ever heard of anybody dying standing on his head?"

His disciples said, "We have not even thought about it. This is hilarious!"
The master stood on his head and died. The disciples were in trouble -- what to do with this man, because they knew what to do if a man dies on his bed, but he was standing on his head. Somebody suggested that the master's sister, who was older than him and living in another Jaina monastery just nearby -- it would be better to ask her. It was a very new situation.
The sister came and she said, "Bozo!" -- that was his childhood name -- "Are you going to stop your mischief or not? Just lie down on the bed!"
Bozo laughed. He was still alive; otherwise, how can you go on standing on your head when you are dead. His sister said, "Die in a normal way." And just to follow his older sister, he died in a normal way!
But it is good to have something new always happening, something new to be accepted; and one should remain open. My sannyasins particularly should remain open, so open that they can take even the whole universe within themselves. There should be no limit to it.

Question 8
BELOVED OSHO,
THE DEVICE OF MALA AND SAFFRON CLOTHES GIVES US AN INTEGRITY, FREEDOM FROM SOCIAL NORMS AND COURAGE TO STAND ALONE. NOW, WITH A FREE SANNYAS, ARE YOU GOING TO CREATE MORE SUBTLE DEVICES TO ACHIEVE THIS?

I am certainly -- because it is time that your meditation should make you different from anybody who is not meditating. Your silence, your love, your compassion, your friendliness, should make you aloof from anybody else. Mala and clothes are very material things. I would like now some spiritual distinctions to be created -- and they are already there. It has happened many times -- people have reported it to me. They had gone to do some work, and perhaps the mala and the clothes might have been a hindrance in the work, so they went in plain, ordinary clothes, but they were recognized. The shopkeeper said, "But something is different about you. You are not the usual kind of person who comes."

And that will be far more beautiful -- that you are recognized by your spirituality, by your integrity, by your individuality, by your compassion, by your love.

But I have not said that people who want to remain in orange and mala have to drop it. Even new sannyasins who want to choose the mala and red, they can. And my feeling is that none of the old sannyasins are going to leave the mala and red clothes. They have become almost part of them -- without them they will feel almost naked.

And the new people who come, even if they come with plain clothes, soon they will start wearing red and the mala, because they will look so much like foreigners, outsiders -- and nobody wants to look like an outsider. Everybody wants to be an insider, in the innermost circle.

So I have opened the doors so people can come in who are just sitting on the fence, who are sympathizers, who always wanted to be sannyasins, but just because of the clothes and the mala, they are afraid. So I want them to get down from

the fence and enter into the temple; and the temple is full of red people. Once they are down off the fence, it will not be a long time before they will be in red.
Red is not going to disappear. It is going to grow more and more. And opening the doors for people who cannot suddenly change their clothes -- let them take their time, why keep them out? Let them meditate -- that will give them courage.
Sannyas will remain red and sannyas will remain with malas. I have opened the door only for those who are half-heartedly standing outside. It does not look good -- let them come in. Painting their clothes will not be very difficult.

Question 9
BELOVED OSHO,
YOU HAVE GREAT RESPECT FOR INDIVIDUALITY, MERITOCRACY, EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR EVERYONE TO BE UNIQUE. HOW CAN WE PRACTICALLY APPLY THESE THINGS IN OUR COMMUNE LIFE?

It is not difficult, it is only a question of outlook.
I am reminded.... In a house there was a painting, and everybody laughed about it to the owner: "Why are you hanging it? It makes no sense!" Finally the owner got fed up, took down the painting and put it in the basement.
One day a man came, and he said, "What happened to the painting that was here? It was an authentic Picasso."
The owner said, "An authentic Picasso? My God, I have put it in the basement. It is worth one million dollars!" He ran, brought the painting, cleaned it and put it back. Now

what had happened? Just a change of outlook. Whether the painting is an authentic Picasso or not is not the question, but his outlook immediately changed.

Every sannyasin has to see in every other sannyasin a unique individual, an authentic creation of existence. And it is true, because nobody else is like you. There are no individuals, even two, who are similar. Even twins are not absolutely similar.

So it is simply a fact that everybody is unique, and everybody has a certain individuality. We just have to drop ideas of how people should be, and we have to replace it with a philosophy that however people are, they are beautiful. There is no question of "should be" because who are we to impose any "should" on anybody? If existence is ready to accept you as you are, then who am I not to?

So just a change of attitude -- and it is a very simple thing, once it gets into your vision. Everybody is unique, everybody is as he is and he should be as he is. There is no need for him to be somebody else to be accepted; he's accepted already. This is what I call respect for individuality, respect for people -- as they are.

The whole humanity can be such a loving and rejoicing place if we can accept people as they are. But we cannot. The wife is trying to tell the husband, in every possible way, how he should be. The husband is trying to tell the wife how she should be. Both are trying to tell the children how they should be.

I was staying in a family, and I asked a child who was sitting just by my side, "What are you going to be when you become big?"

He said, "It is very difficult. I will fall apart."

I said, "Why?"
He said, "My mother wants me to be a doctor, my father wants me to be an engineer, my uncle wants me to be an actor, and nobody bothers to ask me what I want to be. I simply want to be a carpenter, because I love wood and I want to play with wood and make things out of wood.
"But I cannot say this because they will all laugh and say, `You are an idiot. We are talking about being a doctor, an actor, an engineer -- and you want to be a carpenter!'" But that boy, if he becomes a doctor, will remain miserable. If he becomes an engineer he will remain miserable.
I have heard the story of a very great surgeon, a world-famous surgeon, who was retiring. He was seventy-five; still no young man was capable of competing with him -- at the age of seventy-five his hands were like steel.
He was retiring, and all his friends were there: there was great dancing and joy and eating and drinking. But he was sitting in a corner, sad. Somebody said to him, "This is not a time to be sad. Everybody is enjoying -- why don't you come and enjoy?"
He said, "This is a time for me to be sad. I never wanted to be a surgeon. My whole life I wasted being a surgeon. Although I became the topmost surgeon in the world, it has not given me any contentment. I wanted to be a dancer, and even if I had been a street dancer, it would have been closer to my heart's content."
So let the people be what they are. Help them to be what they want. Never impose. And this is respect for humanity.

Light on the Path
Chapter #2

Chapter title: The real difficulty is to be with me
27 December 1985 pm in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
GREETINGS FROM THE INDIAN "RAJNEESH TIMES" FAMILY AND EVERYONE AT THE RAJNEESHDHAM NEO-SANNYAS COMMUNE. THERE ARE MANY SANNYASINS BOTH IN INDIA AND ABROAD WHO HAVE NEVER SEEN YOU, BUT THEIR LOVE FOR YOU AND THEIR COMMITMENT TO YOUR VISION IS AWE-INSPIRING. HOW EXACTLY DOES THIS HAPPEN -- THIS MUCH LOVE, THIS MUCH TRUST?

It is in fact easier if you have not seen me, and yet the love has happened, the commitment. It will be far more pure, far more unconditional, far more impersonal. Seeing me, being with me, and yet loving me totally, is more difficult.
The reasons are that our minds are brought up in such a way that we are always full of expectations. If I fulfill your expectation, it is good; but if I don't fulfill your expectation, then your dedication, your trust, start wavering. And as far as I am concerned, I cannot fulfill your expectation. If I fulfill your expectation, then I will not be the person to help you grow. Your expectation fulfilled, you remain as you are -- no new openings.
I am not here to support your mind.
I am here to take it to ultimate heights.
But your expectations are a problem. In small things, unconsciously, throughout your whole life you are

expecting. And whenever something goes against your idea, you never think that your idea can be wrong; then certainly the person is wrong.

It happened in one Jaina family I used to stay with.... It must have been six in the evening. A very old man, the father of the woman in whose house I was staying, came to see me. Now, in Jaina families, six is almost the last limit for the evening supper. As the sun sets, you cannot eat.

I was just going to take my bath and then to take my supper, but because the old man had come from far away and he must have been almost ninety-five, I said, "Wait, there is no hurry. I can take my bath a little later on and the supper can wait -- there is no problem in it. First, let me talk to him about why he has come."

He was a ninety-five-year-old man and he had been living in a Jaina monastery for thirty years: he had renounced the world. He was recognized as a saint, but just to come to see me was still to be in the Jaina community, so many Jainas had come following him. He told me... the first thing, he touched my feet. I said, "This is not right, because you are ninety-five; even my grandfather is not ninety-five."

He said, "I have wanted to touch your feet for so long. I was afraid that death might spoil everything, and I might not be able to touch your feet. I have read only one of your books -- PATH TO SELF-REALIZATION, and that was it. It changed my whole life. Since then, you have been my master. If it was in my power...."

Jainas have twenty-four tirthankaras, twenty-four prophets, in one period of creation. That means that after millions of years, when this creation dissolves and a new creation starts, then again there will be twenty-four teachers.

He said to me, "We already have twenty-four tirthankaras, but if it was in my power, I would have declared you the twenty-fifth, because what the twenty-four have not been able to do for me, you have done." He was just all praise. Just then, a servant came and said, "Your bath is ready and the supper will become cold."

The old man was in a shock. He said, "What? In the evening you take a bath?"

The Jaina tirthankara does not bathe at all because that is decorating the body, making it non-smelly. It is in the service of something that is lower than you; it has to be sacrificed for the higher. So Jaina tirthankaras don't bathe.

I said to him, "Yes -- one in the morning, one in the evening. I take two baths."

He said, "Moreover, the sun has set, and you have not taken your supper yet?" In the first place, the Jaina tirthankara eats only once -- there is no question of supper. And even if you are eating twice, at least you should be understanding enough to see that it has to be before sunset.

He forgot all his praise -- I was no longer a tirthankara. I had been for years, and just because of a single expectation which I had never promised him I would fulfill.... That was his mind.

But he said, "Then I have been completely wrong. For all these years I have praised you, I have read your books -- but you are not the right man to follow."

I said to him, "Understand a small thing. I never told you to follow me, I never said to read my books. I never told you to make me a tirthankara. I never asked you to have any expectations of me. It was easy because you had not seen me, you had not known me. A book is dead, and the book

you are reading is my first book; and I have gone far. If you had started reading my second and third and fourth books, they would have spoiled all your admiration."
But he was so angry that when he left, I said, "Won't you touch my feet again? -- because you are so old, and next time... we may meet, we may not meet."
He said, "I have made the mistake once, I cannot make it twice."
So it is not a problem for people who have come to me through books, tapes, videos, films. It is easy for them to carry on in their old mind. I don't disturb their old mind: they can interpret my books according to their expectations. The real difficulty is to be with me.
Every day you will find me saying things which are inconsistent. You will see me doing things which I should not be doing, behaving in a way which is not suitable for a prophet, for a messiah, for an incarnation.
So the real problem is for those who have been living with me, because they have had to drop, chunk by chunk, their minds, their conditionings -- themselves. They have to choose continuously every moment between me and themselves: either I exist or they exist; both cannot exist at once. Otherwise, they will be in constant trouble, anxiety. So either they will have to leave me just to protect themselves, or if they are courageous, they will pass through a process which is almost like death, and they will be reborn.
The people who have not come to me are having a very fancy trip, imaginary. Their trust, their love, their commitment is to their own minds. I am only a figment in their minds, not a reality outside, not a reality with which

they will have to shatter themselves the way the ocean shatters itself continuously on the rocks. And that will be the only test.

But ordinarily we think it very strange that people who have only heard my voice on the tape or have only seen me on video, have fallen in love. This is one of the reasons why people love dead saints -- why they are ready to die for Jesus Christ, not even knowing whether he ever existed or not.

There are people who think that Jesus Christ never existed, that it was a Jewish drama that was played every year -- just like, in India, every year we play Rama's life. Nobody knows whether Rama really existed. All that we know is the drama which we have been playing for five thousand years. Our playing the drama for five thousand years continually has given Rama a certain reality.

And it is easier to devote yourself, dedicate yourself to Rama because Rama is only a figment of your mind. You can shape him; you can make him the way you want. You can interpret according to your own thought processes, and he cannot interfere.

It is a known fact that all the religions that you see in the world were born after their founders were dead. Strange! Then why do you call them "founders"? They never founded anything. They were hunted, tortured -- you did everything nasty to them -- and when they died, a great religion arose; and great admiration, because now you could manage them. It is all a game of your imagination.

To accept any man who is contemporary with so much love that your commitment becomes total is a superhuman task. But it transforms.

To recognize Buddha, Mahavira, Jesus Christ changes nobody. Half of the population of the world is Christian, but we don't see anything that can make us feel that Jesus is alive in half of humanity. Millions of churches, millions of priests, but you cannot see in a single priest the glimmer, the shine, the authority that come from one's own experience. All that they can have is an imaginative dedication.

Gods are made by man. But when somebody is alive, it is very difficult to make him a god because he will continuously disturb your idea of a god.

For example, Jainas think that Mahavira never perspired. Now, I cannot manage that, and I know that neither could Mahavira manage it, because perspiration is a natural process -- without perspiration the person will die. Perspiration keeps you at a constant inner temperature. When it is too hot you perspire. The glands all over your body are full of water. In the case of it being too hot, they will release the water. They will deceive the sun. The water is released, and the sun starts evaporating it. The sun does not penetrate inside you; it has been prevented by the perspiration -- completely befooled. It becomes engaged in evaporation and your inner temperature remains exactly the same.

If it is cold you don't perspire; if it is cold you shiver. Shivering makes you hot -- it is a movement against the cold. Shivering keeps you at the same temperature. So whether it is hot or cold, your body is capable of maintaining the same temperature, because its life is very limited: it can survive only within twelve degrees of temperature, from 98 to 110. Below 98 you die, above 110

you are finished. The temperature has to be kept constant -- it is immensely necessary for the life process.
But if you are writing a story or creating an imaginary idea, you can put anything in it -- like Mahavira never perspires. And then that becomes the criterion for the Jainas. They cannot accept anybody as really realized unless they see that, standing naked, he is not perspiring in the hot sun.
It is very easy to create gods out of the past. There was a time when Mahavira was a contemporary man. His contemporaries never recognized him as a god. Buddha and Mahavira were contemporaries. Neither of them recognized the other as a god -- what to say of other people? They had their definitions, and no living being can remain limited within your definitions.
So it is easier for people who are far away, for whom I am almost not a contemporary. They can create any kind of qualities they want in me; they can hallucinate any ideas around me. They have a free choice to dream about me. Their dedication and their love and their commitment is a dream phenomenon. And they will feel very good, very centered, very happy that they have found a man who fits absolutely with their idea of how a man should be. They have not found him; they have created, they have invented him.
But to be near to me, you will have to drop your expectations -- which everybody has in very subtle ways -- and particularly with me because I am persistent that I should not fulfill anybody's expectation; because that would mean I am against him, I am helping his poisonous mind. I have to shatter it, even at the cost of making him my enemy -- but I have to shatter it and I have to live in a

way, speak in a way, say things which he has to accept, understand, even against his whole mind.
It is a struggle to be with a master: the struggle between your mind and the master.
And if the master is a real master, he will not allow your mind to win. Either the master wins or you are free to leave, but you cannot be allowed to win in the game.
This is a very strange game in which the master always has to win. And to be constantly defeated -- and yet be in love with the same man who is defeating you, and yet be committed to the same man who is destroying you -- needs guts. Ordinarily, people can't understand it, but this is the reality.

Question 2
BELOVED OSHO,
THE MEDIOCRE PEOPLE CREATE MUCH FUSS AND FERVOR, MISINTERPRETING THE LOVING, SILENT, SOFT AND MEDITATING SANNYASINS AS BRAINWASHED. WHAT DO YOU SAY ABOUT THIS STATE OF AFFAIRS?

In fact, tell those mediocre people that it is not only a brainwash, it is a mindwash -- far deeper, from the very roots. Brainwashing is just pruning the leaves, which will come again. In fact, if you cut one leaf, three leaves will replace it. The tree is not going to be defeated so soon.
Tell them, "It is a mindwash. And you are on the right path; whatever you are saying is right, but not the total truth, only a fragment. The total truth is, that we have decided to drop the mind completely because the mind has given

nothing but misery, suffering, torture and nightmares. You can have it.

"You can see our people -- they are simple, they are innocent, they are rejoicing, they are loving. If brainwashing can give you this much, it is worth it. What is wrong in it?"

And tell them, "Our master does not stop at brainwashing because that is just superficial. He wants to destroy the mind completely and make us no-minds. That's what he calls meditation.

"But what is the problem for you? You remain happy in your misery, you remain happy in your suffering, you remain happy in all your tortures that you are giving to yourself and others. Why can't you leave a few people who don't want to be miserable and who want to rejoice in life?"

In fact, we should learn to face the mediocre people exactly on their own ground. They say it is mindwashing, they say it is brainwashing. Tell them, "It is. Why are you waiting -- not being washed? It is absolutely dry cleaning. What have you got to save? For what are you afraid?"

Take them -- whatever they say, take them at their own word. If they say it is hypnosis, accept that it is. "But what is wrong in it? You are not happy, you are not rejoicing in your life. You are suffering. You are waiting for a paradise after death -- we have found it here. And if you want to label it as hypnosis, we have no objection. But it is worth it. Come and try! Perhaps you may also like the taste.

"We have tried both: your life we have lived and we know it is hell; and our life, which you call hypnosis, we have also lived. We choose hypnosis against hell."

Those people simply throw words at you. They think just by throwing words they can condemn a certain phenomenon. They are stupid. And rather than fighting about words -- that it is not brainwashing, it is not hypnosis.... You are getting caught by those idiots in their trap.

It is better to shock them and say, "It is." But make it clear: "We know both -- we know your life, we have lived it; and we know this life, we are living it. You don't know both so you cannot say anything about our life.

"Have a little courage. Experience our life too, then you will be able to compare. And if you find that the brainwashed life of a sannyasin, the hypnotized life of a sannyasin is not so great as the old hell was, you can always go back to your hell. We will all support you -- we will throw you out of the ashram!"

I have found that it is easier to accept their label and not to make any unnecessary argument about the label -- the label does not matter. On the contrary, make it a point: "You should experience it -- you are talking without experience. You don't have any way to compare. We can compare, and still we are not coming to your hell."

Question 3

BELOVED OSHO,

IT SEEMS THAT THE U.S. AUTHORITIES AND GOVERNMENT -- AND THE GOVERNMENTS AROUND THE WORLD -- ARE MORE SHOCKED BY YOUR SANNYASINS' TOGETHERNESS AND COURAGE THAN WE OURSELVES WERE BY THEIR BRUTAL MISTREATMENT OF YOU. OSHO, DO YOU

FEEL WE HAVE MISSED SOMETHING; OR WHAT ELSE MAY WE LEARN FROM SUCH EXTREME SITUATIONS?

No, you have not missed anything. It was so new for you that you could not figure out what was happening; you were in a state of confusion. But you showed your strength perfectly well, and you made the American government aware that they cannot do anything to me without destroying their own image of democracy. It was a high-risk thing.

One of the sheriffs of a jail I was in -- the first jail I was in -- became very friendly and he told me, "I should not tell you, but thousands of telegrams, thousands of phone calls, thousands of flowers from all over the world, thousands of protests... the government is shaken.

"They had not expected that, in touching a single man, they were playing with fire. So one thing I can tell you -- they cannot harm you. They will not even touch your body. On the contrary, instructions are that you should be given absolute security, that nothing should happen to you; otherwise we will not be able to show our face to the world."

And it was strange that they had to give me the same kind of security as they give to the president of America: five cars following me, five motorcycles following, and the roads blocked. They were afraid that anybody could do any harm to me under their protection -- they would be responsible for it.

This man said to me, "This is for the first time in my life that we are not concerned about your escaping. We are

concerned that nobody harms you, otherwise that harm will be on our heads."

On the first day -- just two or three hours after I had arrived -- somebody from Australia called him: "You must be worried because so many phone calls will be coming, telegrams coming."

The sheriff said to the man, "No, we are accustomed... this is a very special jail and we have had people of importance, of cabinet standing -- that is, from the highest political structure. So there is not much of problem."

But after three days, with tears, he apologized to me. He said, "What I said to that man will remain heavy on my heart. I don't know his number; otherwise I would have apologized to him. You had been here only two or three hours, so I did not know about you. But now, after three days, I can say with absolute certainty that we have never had such a man in the jail. The whole jail is for you! Five hundred inmates are for you, the whole hospital department is for you -- I am for you. And the whole world is focused on you. If something happens to you it will be really dangerous for America's image.

"So I want you to forgive me for telling that man that we have had many very important people. That was wrong. We have never had such a person, about whom the whole world is concerned. We have had people of cabinet standing; they were, at the most, of national importance, but nobody who had any international importance, and so much love."

The second day he asked me, "What are we going to do with the flowers? So many flowers are coming, and in this big jail, we don't have space."

So I told him, "Send the flowers to all the schools, colleges and universities, from me." He did that, and the response was immense. When I was taken from the jail to the airport again, all along the way were students throwing flowers.
In fact, the government must have been repenting that they made a stupid mistake. They unnecessarily made our silent movement a world-famous phenomenon. Now it is a household name around the world, in all the languages.
Those twelve days in jail have been of immense help to the movement. They could not do anything because there was nothing that was in their hands to do; they simply became fools. What have they gained?
We had changed their desert into an oasis; again it will be a desert -- that is their gain. But we have gained much. Those four years will now become the foundation of a new commune -- naturally, far superior, far better. Then, we were not so expert, and it gave us many ideas....
For example, now I am not going to make a commune in a country under any government. I am trying for an absolutely independent island, so you don't need any visa, you don't need anybody to tell you how long you can stay. We are not going to create a government there, we are not going to make it a nation -- because I am against nations and against governments. And we have to prove in that commune something more now: that people can live without government, and people can live without a nation, and people can live without armies; that people need not have jails, they don't have to have the police, they don't need any judges.
So, it has been tremendously helpful, and to the whole community of sannyasins around the world it has brought

life. They started realizing that they were doing something significant which could disturb the greatest power of the world.

It is not without reason that America was disturbed. It was disturbed because we were creating something that would disturb every government and every politician.

So now sannyas is no longer just your meditation, your peace, your silence, your life. Now we have become involved, in a very strange way, in the destiny of the whole world. They have forced us. We were going silently on our own; we were not troubling them.

They have provoked us, so now it is for us to prove that they were right!

Now it is not only going to be an individual revolution in a person's life. We will create a place which will become a model for the whole world -- if this can happen with five or ten thousand or more people, why can't it happen everywhere? We, for the first time, are entering into problems which the world leaders have failed to solve in thousands of years; we can solve them within five years. And the spirit is high.

Certainly sannyasins suffered because I was in jail, and they felt helpless that they could not do anything. But they should not feel that way. They did everything that was needed. All that was needed was the world opinion, and they changed the world opinion. We have now more sympathy than we ever had. More of the intelligentsia than ever is now interested. All the news media of the world... we have been covered for almost two months continuously, and still there is a demand from every country: they want to come and want to know more about it.

In the light of all that has happened, we have been immensely victorious. Who cares if they destroy the houses and the streets? We are not houses and we are not streets. And if we could create that commune, then we can create many communes anywhere.

And this time it will be the focus of the world. It will not be just for the people who want to separate from the ordinary world, recluses. This time we are going to make it a point that it remains the focus of the world, that the whole world has to learn something from it. They have provoked us -- now we have to take the challenge. And I love challenges. And I love changes -- so there is nothing to be worried about.

We are in a far better condition than we have ever been. It is always difficult situations which bring out the best in you. When the situations are not difficult, the human tendency is to relax, to be lazy. If the house is on fire, immediately you will see everybody at his best. Nobody will bother about the snow or the cold or anything.

America has provoked its own death by attacking us. It will take a little time, but that's how I see it.

Question 4

BELOVED OSHO,

ONCE YOU SAID THAT TWO HUNDRED ENLIGHTENED PEOPLE WOULD CREATE AN ENERGY THAT COULD NULLIFY THE FORCES THAT CAN START A THIRD WORLD WAR. HOW CLOSE ARE YOU TO FINDING THE TWO HUNDRED?

I am very close. But many things have changed in the meantime.

One thing is certain, that we will be able to produce two hundred enlightened people and prevent the third world war. The question which has arisen in the meantime -- that is where I become unpredictable -- is whether we would like to prevent the third world war. Is it worth preventing these idiots continuing? Will it not be better that the idiots fight and destroy each other and very few people are left in the world to start from scratch?

Nobody has thought about it, but my feeling is that it may be an existential necessity: humanity has arrived at such ugly, inhuman, and poisonous ways that it is better then to let it be finished. Why bother to protect Ronald Reagan? I don't see the point.

So this is something of great importance -- why not start afresh? Humanity is so much burdened with old, rotten stuff, that to go on protecting it and protecting it.... That rotten stuff is also protected, those conditionings are also protected. It will be good that Islam is gone, Hinduism is gone, Christianity is gone, the pope is gone, the Vatican is gone.

Certainly a few people will remain. Those people will be the aboriginals who had no religion, who had no politics, who had no education, who are living as naturally as possible. It will be far better, once this Soviet Union and U.S.A. are gone, to begin the new man -- because he will not have any past. All past will be gone. The new, the remaining few, will have only a future and the experience of what happened to the past; not to repeat it... to find out new ways of living.

So I am trying to search for an island so far off that it will remain unaffected by any war that happens between America and Russia -- let them have it, they deserve it -- and we can create a society there. If the world is finished, then we can spread around the world the people that we have saved, to start absolutely fresh. Perhaps existence is tired of man and the ways he has turned to.
So those two hundred people are close by, but I may prevent... I may tell them just to wait a little. First let the third world war happen and then you can become enlightened and go around the world finding people, because then there will be no passports needed, no visas needed and the whole world will be available to everybody for the first time.
It looks dangerous, the idea....
But I like dangerous ideas.

Question 5
BELOVED OSHO,
WHY DO INDIAN JOURNALISTS ONLY RECORD AND PUBLISH YOUR CRITIQUES OF INDIA? I NEVER REMEMBER READING ABOUT YOUR BEAUTIFUL DISCOURSES ON THE REAL INDIA.

The reason is simple: there is no such thing as free Indian journalism. Either the government is keeping a hold on the latest news media, television, radio, directly... and particularly in a country like India, where most of the people cannot read -- but they can see, they can hear. So the government is being really cunning in keeping the radio and television in their own hands to approach eighty

percent of India and just fill those minds with their own ideas.

Only the newspapers are there. They look free, but they are not. The government has indirectly curtailed their freedom as much as possible. Any newspaper that goes against the directions given to it has its quota for newsprint cut. Newsprint paper is not available on the market, it is in the government's hands. Now, this is a subtle strategy; "You write what we want; otherwise you don't have anything to write upon."

The Indian newspapers live mostly on government advertisement. The moment they start writing anything that the government does not want, those advertisements are removed. Those newspapers die automatically without anybody directly killing them. All the newspapers belong to a few super-rich people -- just four or five families. Those four or five families are basically for the government because they need licenses; they need every kind of support from the government, and it is a deal that their papers should remain according to the government policy. So in fact, looking at the whole picture, India has no free journalism. They write only what their owners want them to write.

Now as far as I am concerned, they have to write only things which create antagonism against me in the Indian mind. To me, life is both day and night, life and death, and I have spoken on it from all possible angles. But a paper which is owned by a Hindu owner will not publish anything that creates sympathy towards me in the masses.

I have spoken on so much that no Hindu has ever spoken on. If they choose to, they could convert the whole of India

for me. But that is what they are afraid of, so they choose only those parts where I have criticized.

And I am not a politician. My whole life, politicians have been advising me, "You could become an immense phenomenon in the country, millions of people could stand with you; you just have to be a little careful. You speak so beautifully about Hinduism -- then why do you sometimes start criticizing it! You speak so beautiful about Jainism; then on some small point you criticize it.

"You have spoken so much on Buddhism -- nobody has spoken so much -- and still no Buddhist is sympathetic to you because you go on criticizing it. Ninety percent of your talks explain to them the beauties of Gautam Buddha and his teachings, so if you can avoid the ten percent...."

I said, "That is impossible. That will be cheating people. I know that that ten percent is there; it will be cheating the people not to say anything about it. And it will be a heavy burden on my heart that I have not been completely open: that I have been looking at the people and saying to them what they want to listen to, rather than talking to people about what I have to say."

So I told them, "I have decided to remain alone -- I don't want your millions of people with me. But I will say the whole thing. I will bring out the beauty but I will not neglect the ugliness that is there, because the beauty is something that only a few, rare, intelligent people can understand. So even Buddha has talked about it, but it has gone over people's heads. But the ugliness, which is only ten percent, has affected people's lives.

"The ninety percent has not affected people's lives at all, but the ten percent has. Now you are telling me not to also

talk about that ten percent which has caused all the misery, all the poverty, and all kinds of stupidities in the country. I cannot accept your advice."

For example, it is beautiful that Buddha talked about nonviolence, but then who is going to be responsible for the two-thousand-years' slavery of the country? His teaching of nonviolence is incomplete. People accepted it, that it is perfectly good; and the teaching made people not brave but cowards. They were talking about not killing people, but basically what was in their minds was that they should not be killed. So if you are not to kill, you will be saved also. That is not necessary. Buddha never told them, "Your not killing others does not mean that they will not kill you." Nor did Mahavira tell them that. Then what will you do when people want to invade your country, take your possessions, take your wives, kill your children, rape your women, burn your houses and cities? Then what is the nonviolence going to do?

According to me, a really nonviolent person is one who does not kill anybody, does not harm anybody, because he is against killing and against harming; but if somebody starts harming him, then too, he is against killing; he won't allow it.

He will never initiate any violence, but if violence is initiated against him, then he's going to fight tooth and nail. Only then can the nonviolent people remain independent; otherwise they will be slaves, and poor, and continually robbed.

For two thousand years, how many people have been robbed in India? Who is responsible for it? Buddha and Mahavira are both responsible for it. Now, to say that will

mean that immediately the Jaina newspapers will take it, the Buddhist newspapers will take it and antagonize the Buddhists and the Jainas. But I cannot prevent myself from saying the whole truth.
So it will take a little time.
In fact, the way our movement has spread is phenomenal. None of Jesus' disciples were educated, none of them were cultured, civilized. They were fishermen, farmers, woodcutters -- of the same category as Jesus himself was. He was uneducated, he could not read or write. All that he could manage, altogether, was twelve disciples. Not a single rabbi was his follower, not a single professor was his follower. Not a single man of culture, understanding, intelligence, was his follower.
Our movement is phenomenal. Just within fifteen years it has already taken over the world. Just ten years more and there will be no problem: all these idiots who are trying to provoke antagonism -- they will all be running after you. This happened when I was in jail. The whole American news media turned immediately sympathetic, because they could see that America was torturing an innocent man who has done no harm, who has not committed any crime. His only crime is that he has created a beautiful commune, a lovely place: whoever visits it comes out dreaming, "Someday I would like to join." This was my only crime. We have the most intelligent people around the world as sannyasins. So all these mediocre people and journalists don't matter at all. And these are slaves. You will see: as the Western press and news media are turning sympathetic towards me, these idiots will follow them. They have that mentality, of slaves.

It happened that when Rabindranath Tagore was given a Nobel Prize, only then did India come to know that they had a great poet. And universities started inviting him to accept doctorates. The first was Calcutta University -- and he had lived in Calcutta his whole life, and he has written his best things in Bengali. He got the Nobel Prize for a small book which he himself translated. The major part of his literature, which remains untranslated, is far more important.

But Calcutta University had not bothered to give him a doctorate, and now, because he had gotten the Nobel Prize, all Indian universities.... But Rabindranath was a man I love. He refused Calcutta University. He said, "You are giving a doctorate to the Nobel Prize, not to me. I have been here my whole life; you have never even asked me to come to the university to recite my poetry to people. Why should I accept your doctorate? It is an insult."

But this is how this country is. For remaining slaves for two thousand years you cannot condemn them. They just look towards the West -- whatever happens there, soon they are bound to follow. And the West -- its press, its news media -- is becoming very friendly and very loving. So these people should be following soon. There is nothing to be worried about.

And what harm can they do? My experience is that nobody harms me, whether he writes for me or against me. He should just go on writing.

I will use both ways. You can't have the whole world as your friend -- and it would be monotonous. Enemies add some spice.

Light on the Path

Chapter #3

Chapter title: Now our commune exists all over the world
29 December 1985 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
THESE QUESTIONS ARE FROM A CENTER IN AMERICA, AND THEY SAY, "WE ARE STARTING A NEW NEWSPAPER IN AMERICA DEDICATED TO YOUR VISION FOR HUMANITY. WE WOULD LIKE TO CALL IT, `VISION INTERNATIONAL.'" THEIR FIRST QUESTION IS: DO YOU LIKE THE NAME?

Yes, absolutely yes.

Question 2
THE SECOND QUESTION: DO YOU HAVE ANY MESSAGE FOR US IN THIS NEW BEGINNING?

Just remember one thing: the sannyas movement has entered a critical stage. It is a good sign; it will bring maturity, strength, togetherness.
What is to be remembered is that this strength, this togetherness does not become an organization. It remains the movement of individuals who are together because their experience is similar. They are not part of a religion, they are not a church; their individuality is absolutely intact....
Because that is one of the most difficult things: in times of difficulty one tends to become organized because that way

you can fight better, you can oppose the enemy better. But my emphasis is that in opposing the enemy you create a bigger enemy within yourself: the organization, the church, the religion. The whole thing is defeated.
So remain continuously aware and make your readers remember in different ways in different times, that my message is for the individual, and I stand for absolute freedom, individuality. If we are together and if we are fighting together our aim is to fight for individuality and freedom. We are not going to become unconsciously a church, an organization.
That has happened to all the religions in the past. It was a calamity. Avoid the calamity.

Question 3
ALMOST TWO YEARS AGO SHEELA TOLD US YOU WANTED YOUR SANNYASINS TO LEAVE CALIFORNIA AND CLOSE THE CENTERS THERE. BUT NOW THAT THE RANCH IS ENDING, THOUSANDS OF SANNYASINS HAVE GONE THERE TO LIVE. WOULD YOU LIKE TO SAY SOMETHING TO THEM? 3

It was simply a device to call people to the commune in Oregon. Now that the commune exists no more, the sannyasins in California should start their centers -- if possible, communes. But remember that Oregon's commune was the model, and in California no compromise should be made.
California is in a strange kind of mind -- everything there is fashion. So within four, five years, it dies; a newer fashion

takes place. Within the last thirty years many things have happened in California with a predictably great future, but they all died within two, three years. So make centers and communes in California, but avoid the Californian tendency of taking everything as a fashion.
Sannyas is not a fashion -- it is one of the most eternal things in existence. It will be there always, it has been there always -- because it is the search for the truth, it cannot be reduced to a fashion.

Question 4
BELOVED OSHO,
WHEN WE ARE SCATTERED THROUGHOUT THE WORLD, MOST OF US FAR FROM YOU AND LIVING IN SMALL GROUPS. THEN WHAT IS THE MEANING OF THE SECOND GACHCHHAMI: SANGHAM SHARANAM GACHCHHAMI?

Now it has more meaning than it had before. Let me tell you about all the gachchhamis.
The first is: Buddham sharanam gachchhami: "I go to the feet of the awakened one." It is an approach of humbleness, openness, non-resistance. Without such an approach no master can function. The disciple has to give way for the master to enter the innermost core of his being. And that's what he is saying: Buddham sharanam gachchhami -- "I go to the feet of the awakened one." He is saying, "I am no more." He is saying, "Now you can do anything you want to do with me. I am absent and I want your presence in me."

The second gachchhami is Sangham sharanam gachchhami -- "I go to the feet of the commune of the awakened one." The question has arisen about the second because now the commune in America is no more -- but there are sannyasins all around the world. In a very subtle way, now our commune exists all over the world.

So don't take it that the Oregon commune's disappearance is just a disappearance; it has appeared everywhere where a sannyasin is alive and breathing. So the second gachchhami does not lose any meaning, it gains more meaning. It becomes universal.

It is easy to go to a master and to surrender. It is the simplest thing to do because the awakened person functions almost like a magnet. You are not doing anything, you are simply being pulled by the magnet. The second gachchhami is difficult, and hence more important than the first.

Now you are not only magnetically attracted by the charisma of the master.... You have tasted his love, his compassion, his awareness, his being. In his disciples it will not be so strong, it will not be a magnetic force.... But you have tasted the very being of the master in your surrender: you can recognize that anybody who has surrendered to the master has become in a very deep sense your brother or your sister. A love, because of the master, has arisen amongst the disciples. I call it love, I don't want to call it any kind of organization. And to surrender to these simple people who have not yet arrived will make you more humble, will take your ego completely away from you.

The commune is now all over the world. Wherever a sannyasin exists, the commune exists. And when you are

saying, "I go to the feet of the commune," you are surrendering to millions of people. It is a tremendous experience of being egoless.

With a master there is a difficulty: you may surrender to a master because he is worthy of that -- it is almost a demand from his very being. He is not saying anything to you, but his every breath is a demand. And the height of the man and the flight of his consciousness, on the one hand will help you to go to his feet; but on the other hand it may give rise to a subtle ego, that you have found a great master. In finding a great master, unconsciously you think you have become a great disciple.

But when you are doing the second gachchhami that possibility does not exist at all. You are simply being humble, you are simply showing your love -- through the disciples -- to the master.

The third gachchhami is Dhammam sharanam gachchhami: "I go to the feet of the ultimate realization of the master." It is possible only after these first two gachchhamis that you can meaningfully say, "I go to the feet of the ultimate experience" -- because it is abstract. The master was very tangible. The commune was not so tangible. And now particularly when you say, "I go to the feet of the commune," you cannot even visualize or imagine it, because there is no commune as such, but individual sannyasins all over the world. But the third is the most difficult in the sense that you are entering abstraction -- the religious experience, the experience of truth. You don't know anything about it.

You have seen the man who has visited the land, you have felt his vibe, you have smelled the fragrance that he has

brought, you have seen the light that is still lingering around him. In your deep surrender you have felt that this man is not what he looks; he is much more. He is carrying something invisible within himself.
This has been only a vague feeling, but it gives you an impetus to surrender yourself to the ultimate experience that has created the master, that has created the commune and that has become a star of attraction for you, a deep inspiration for you.
In the beginning the third gachchhami will be vague, abstract, but as you go on deeper in your surrender, with the first two gachchhamis, the third starts taking on more of a reality. It is not a dream, it starts becoming a truth.
All those three gachchhamis are deeply interconnected so none of them can be dropped at any point.

Question 5
BELOVED OSHO,
IF NATIONAL BOUNDARIES AND VISA RESTRICTIONS CONTINUE TO SEPARATE US FROM YOU AND FROM EACH OTHER, WHAT IS BEST FOR US TO DO ABOUT IT?

They will not. It is for me to find a way that they don't restrict you from seeing me, from being with me. I am working on it, and I don't think it will take a long time to find a way; perhaps a month at the most. So nobody need worry about it. We will soon have our own place which will not be under any country's rule.
And I want a totally new experiment that has not happened in history. There have been anarchists -- their philosophy is

one of the best. But it is so good that it becomes impossible to make it real; it remains utopian. Prince Kropotkin, Tolstoy -- these people dreamed of a humanity which one day would drop all governments.

They thought that governments are the causes of all the evil that exists on the earth. To some extent they are right, but only to some extent. I cannot agree with them totally, because I know that if governments are removed, it will not be a beautiful world; it will be simply a chaos, full of evil -- and much more than it was before, because all restrictions will have been removed, and all ugly instincts in man will still be there.

Just by removing a government you cannot change a murderer, and you cannot change a thief, and you cannot change a rapist. The government is not the cause but the effect. That's where I differ from Prince Kropotkin, who has the clearest vision of anarchism. The government is there because man is not able to remain ungoverned. He needs somebody to keep him in control; otherwise he will be violent and he will do every nasty thing that is possible. The government exists because man needs it. The government is ugly; it should not exist, but what can be done?

If you have cancer then somebody has to do the surgery. We don't want surgeons in the world, but if cancer continues to exist, we will need surgeons for it. The surgeons are not creating the cancer, the cancer is creating the surgeons.

This is one philosophy which has for centuries dominated the most highly intelligent people -- the idea of absolute freedom, no restriction, no nation, no government. The

other idea that has dominated human mind -- and which has already tried to become a reality -- is also very important. That is communism -- that all men should be equal, there should be equality.

Inequality is ugly. Some people have all the riches, some people have nothing. In America, thirty million people are dying because they don't have any food. And exactly the same number -- thirty million people -- are dying because of overeating.

Now, this must be a mad world! Things can be figured out very easily: these people should not overeat. They are eating those thirty million people's lives, and they are destroying themselves in that effort. They can all live -- sixty million people can live peacefully, but the second thirty million are eating the food of the first thirty million. These will die of starvation and the other people will die of obesity.

Communism has a tremendous appeal, but to me there is a very basic flaw in it. That is, that men basically and psychologically are not equal, neither physically nor mentally nor... in any way. Equality can be forced, but anything forced cannot remain forever. The moment the force is removed the equality will disappear.

In Russia now seventy years have passed since the revolution and they go on increasing the force to keep people equal. Now what kind of equality is this? The whole country has become a concentration camp. And whenever you try to make people equal by force, a strange thing is bound to happen: the lowest denominator will be the determining factor. You cannot make an idiot Albert Einstein, but you can make Albert Einstein an idiot. If you

want equality then the lowest will be the norm -- and that is absolutely unacceptable. So to me equality is not a value. But I understand communism in a totally different way. I think of communism as an equal opportunity for everybody to be himself -- not to be equal but to be unique. Equal opportunity to be unequal -- that is my definition of communism. And I want, in the place that I am searching for -- and I am very close to finding it -- that we create a small commune for the first time in history, which has no government and which has no classes like the rich and the poor; still, equal opportunity for everybody to be himself. Somebody is going to be Yehudi Menuhin and somebody is going to be Rabindranath Tagore and somebody is going to be Albert Einstein. And it will be ugly to destroy these people -- because they are the very salt of the earth -- just to create a society of idiots, retarded people. They may be equal but that society will not be worth living in.

And in the commune in Oregon I became aware of a simple method to do it: just remove money from the commune. Anybody can donate to the commune but nobody can purchase anything with money. Yes, whatever is anybody's need, the commune should fulfill it: each according to his need. And if you just remove money as a method of exchange, a miracle happens. You may have millions of dollars, and I may not have a single dollar; but you are not richer and I am not poorer -- because you cannot use your millions of dollars. In fact I am freer than you. You are carrying a load, a burden, unnecessarily; and I am not carrying the load of a single dollar. And my needs are fulfilled by the commune as much as your needs are.

There are still islands which are absolutely without any control by any government. A few are very undeveloped, so it will be a difficult job to develop them. But there are three islands which are fully developed; one has even an airport -- it belongs to an individual who is willing to sell it. The situation is such -- there are five miles of land which is lush green with big trees... immense beauty. It is almost an oval-shaped island. One part is above sea level. It has the greenery and on it the owner has made small houses.

From the outside they look like the houses ancient, primitive people used to live in, so they do not stand apart from the trees and from the greenery; they are part of it. But from inside they are air-conditioned and with all modern equipment. The island has twelve bungalows, one hotel for eighty persons, one airport where, morning and evening, the plane comes; we can have our own planes. And the other part of the island is five, six feet under the sea. The owner has not done anything on that part, and to me that part seems to be the most important, because we can make a five-mile row of houseboats -- like Kashmir -- on that. And it will look far better than Kashmir because on Kashmir you can see the land; the boat is attached to the land, the land is underneath the boat.

You can see water all around and there can be boats for five miles. We can accommodate thousands of sannyasins in those houses. They are beautiful houses, and we can improve upon them. And between the two -- the forest in front, the houseboats at the back -- between the two is a big lake. So small boats can move in the lake to provide small things for people on the boats. It is something absolutely ideal.

And the person is in a hurry to sell it. Perhaps he is financially broke, perhaps he is too old and now he has no energy for it. So most probably we will get it.
And the most historical thing will be.... Communism and anarchism have remained enemies, because anarchism says no government, and communism says a very strict government is needed; otherwise you cannot destroy the divisions between classes of the rich and the poor.
So communism says, "We need a dictatorship; even democracy will not do. We need an absolute totalitarian dictatorship." On this point these two beautiful philosophies have such a disagreement that there is no possibility of agreement: "Government is the evil and you are making the evil more evil -- you are making it a dictatorship. Even democracy is an evil. No government is the only way for humanity," according to the anarchist.
But we can manage very easily because for seventy years, although communism has tried, it has failed: it has not been able to create a classless society. Yes, the rich have disappeared -- they destroyed them. They killed one million people after the revolution, so the rich have disappeared. Only the poor are still poor. But the poor feel a certain satisfaction because now there is nobody to compare themselves with. There is nobody who is richer than them: everybody is equally poor.
This was not the idea; everybody should be equally rich. Then only there is some point; otherwise this is sheer stupidity. These people were poor before; a few people were rich and were enjoying the riches. You have not evolved the society; you have destroyed those people -- their culture, their music, their literature, their dances -- and

you have created a society which is equally poor. And to keep them equally poor... because there are people who are creative, and if the government pressure is removed, soon you will see, within four years, there will be richer people and there will be poor people in Russia.

For seventy years they have been repressing and within four years all their repression will be gone: the rich will be rich and the poor will be poor.... Because richness is also an art. For example, you can see in America -- before three hundred years ago, American Indians had lived for millions of years, poor. The same country, the same land, the same potentiality of the country, and for millions of years they have been the most poor on the earth.

And then three hundred years ago, as Columbus discovered America and the people from the West reached there, America became the richest country. Strange! The American Indians could not make anything out of America, and these people made it the richest country in the whole history.

So there are people... and there is an art how to create wealth. Russia is poor, and it will remain poor because it is not allowing its creative people, who can manage, to create wealth. It is repressing them and keeping them equal.

In my conception we can, for the first time, manage anarchism and communism both together. Just remove currency within the commune, and without any enforcement, without forcing people to be equal, we have brought a classless society. They will remain unequal; they will remain unique; they will remain themselves. And the commune's function is to fulfill their needs. Their needs are

different: somebody who plays on a flute needs a flute, and somebody who wants to play on a guitar needs a guitar. In every dimension people should remain themselves, but the dignity of humanity will be equal because they have equal opportunity -- and no government, because government is not needed.

There can be only a functional organization, just like the post office. Nobody knows who is the head postmaster of India -- there is no need and the post office is working perfectly well. It is a functional organization. The railways -- now, who knows who is the chief of the board of the railways? It is a functional organization. So we can have functional organizations without having any government. There will be no need for any visas for anybody to come for as long as he wants to stay; there will be no need for any passport. At least we can create one place in the world where no nationality is recognized, no religion is recognized, no political boundaries are recognized. And perhaps that may give the idea to other people, that it is possible -- and these are the same human beings, they have come from us. Just an absolutely clear-cut model is needed. So there is no need to be worried. It is only a question of a few weeks.... And soon we will have our own place, and I will call all my people to start working. And we can absorb as many people as we want, because we are not thinking of making houses, we are thinking of making houseboats. Then the ocean is unlimited; then there is no problem about it. Why bother about land? Just a small piece of land will be enough for the functional things -- the hotel, the airport. Otherwise we can go on spreading on the ocean.

And about the ocean the laws are such that around any island or land, two hundred miles of ocean is yours. So around the island for two hundred miles we can spread as much as.... And it will be a more mobile society. All those boats can move, all those houses can move. It will be more alive; it will not be a dead society, fixed, where everything remains where it is.

Man has not tried to live... otherwise water can be a far more beautiful place to live. Freedom to move -- otherwise you become attached to the house, to the land. And I know of methods in Japan: they float gardens on the water. They mix straw with earth and float it, and then you can put any seeds on it; you can have roses and you can have all kinds of flowers. Japan has tried floating gardens for thousands of years; it is a perfect science.

And we have our sannyasins who can come and make floating gardens all around, so you don't miss anything. One sannyasin has reported that one of his friends, a scientist, has made a house under water, fully air-conditioned with everything palatial, and on top he has made a beautiful garden. So you see only the garden; the house is underwater. And from the garden is the door to enter into the house. And he has found a special glue to mix with cement so that water cannot disturb it.

And he has succeeded in it. He has made it -- it is now a successful experiment. We can call that man and we can give him all the opportunity to make houses underwater. An underwater house has a totally different beauty. You can make it in glass all around. Just as you can see the sky, you can see the ocean and the fish. And they are so colorful and they have such a beauty. Many of them have their own

torches. In the night it is a procession of torches -- those fishes flash light.

I have been reading about one man who has made a small experiment, which is successful, so that houses.... If the earth is shrinking because of the population... he has made houses in the air. It used to be just a proverb, "Castles in the air," things to be rejected; but now he is ready to make real castles in the air. Just a big balloon, and inside you can make a whole city -- and it will be floating. You can direct it in any direction, and you can send people from it to the earth.

Just, people remain orthodox about everything, so whatsoever has been done, they go on doing it. My hope is that in our commune we will try everything new; and drop the whole idea of how people have lived. And we will start not only on the economic, the psychological, the spiritual, but on the physical -- on everything... fresh and new, and make it a model for the whole universe. You will have so many tourists that it will be enough to feed your whole commune.

And these Japanese who float pieces of earth on the ocean, on the river, on the lake -- they grow flowers; they can grow food also. It is only a question of accepting the unknown and exploring it.

So no sannyasin has to be worried about it. Within a month we will have our place, and within a year people will start coming. And my idea is: perhaps on earth we cannot make a commune of one hundred thousand sannyasins, but on the ocean we can. And we are going to do it!

Question 6

BELOVED OSHO,
CAN YOU SAY SOMETHING TO US TO HELP US REMEMBER YOU AS OUR FRIEND, AND NOT GET CAUGHT UP IN OUR CONDITIONING WHICH TRIES TO MAKE YOU AN AUTHORITY FIGURE?

Everything that I am saying to you is the answer to your question. Why the fear? -- I am not an authoritarian figure. I don't claim to be the only begotten son of God, an incarnation of God, a messiah, a prophet. How can you make me an authoritarian figure?

These people who have become authoritarian figures -- they themselves were responsible; nobody made them. In fact the whole of Judea was trying to convince Jesus Christ: "You are not the only son of God -- drop this nonsense!" But he was insistent. He was so insistent that they got fed up with the man and crucified him.

All these people were trying to become authoritarian figures. But a small distinction has to be understood: to be an authoritarian figure is one thing, and to be an authority is a different thing.

The authoritarian says, "Whatever I say, you believe, because it comes directly from God and I have a direct communication line -- which you don't have. It is none of your business to doubt. Doubt will be punished -- faith will be rewarded."

But to be an authority is a totally different thing. It means that whatever I am saying, I am saying on my own authority; it is not within quotation marks. It is not that I am representing God, that I am representing Jesus Christ,

or Krishna, or Buddha. It is not that I am simply a successor to any authority figure.
To be an authority simply means that it is my own experience, and I am speaking out of my own authority. It does not require you to believe, it requires you to enquire. But I can say authoritatively that you will find it, because I have found it. There is no reason why you cannot find it. So anybody who speaks on his own experience is an authority, but he is not an authority figure. He is not authoritarian; he is simply an authority. You can doubt what I say -- you will not be punished. You can believe what I say -- you will not be rewarded. All that you have to do is to enquire and follow the path and find it out yourself. One thing is certain, that when I am saying it to you, it is not borrowed, it is my own experience.

Question 7
BELOVED OSHO,
WILL YOU DESCRIBE FOR US WHAT YOUR DAILY LIFE IS LIKE?

It is the same as it has always been! -- and it will be the same always. I never miss anything. Even in jail I enjoyed it; although it was absolutely a different world. In twelve days I took only one shower! -- and that too because Vivek persisted. She used to meet me in court and her only insistence was, "You should take a shower!"
And I told her, "I am enjoying resting in my bed twenty-four hours a day. And when I come out I can take a good shower for all the twelve days -- don't be worried!"

In the jail they were asking me... because as I was being moved from one jail to another the press would ask many questions. One question was: "How are you feeling?"
I said, "Great -- as I have always felt."
They said, "This is a JAIL!"
I said, "This may be a jail but you cannot imprison me. Yes, my hands are chained, my legs are chained, but that does not imprison me; I am simply watching the whole scene. And for years I have not rested twenty-four hours a day with closed eyes."
Even the inmates would come and say, "Bhagwan, are you sick or something?"
"I am not sick, I am really feeling very good!"
And exactly that's what happened: when I left the jail the jailer told me, "You are the first person in my life who is leaving jail better than he had come in! You look so rested."
I said, "What else to do in a jail!" And this is my whole philosophy: to make the best out of the worst.

Question 8
BELOVED OSHO,
INDIAN PEOPLE PARTICULARLY ASK THE QUESTION AGAIN AND AGAIN, THAT JUST AS YOU HAVE DROPPED THE RELIGION OF RAJNEESHISM -- FREED THE SANNYASINS FROM THE MALA AND RED CLOTHES -- ARE YOU ONE DAY GOING TO DROP THE TITLE OF "OSHO" TOO? IT PREVENTS MANY PEOPLE FROM COMING TO YOU.

It has been raised in many articles and many books written against me, so it is good to go into it in a little detail.
First, "Bhagwan" is not a title. Nobody can give that title. Nor is "Bhagwan" a degree, that you can pass an examination and the degree can be conferred on you. Nor is "Bhagwan" some position that can be appointed by a committee or by some people. Nor is "Bhagwan" an elected post, that you fight an election and whosoever has the majority of votes becomes Bhagwan.
The critics who have been writing against me, they have always made it a point that I am "self-appointed" Bhagwan. And I have always wondered, do they have anybody -- Rama, Krishna, Buddha, Mohammed -- appointed by somebody else?
If Rama is appointed by somebody else as Bhagwan, then certainly the appointing authority is higher -- and if you can be appointed, you can be dis-appointed too.
This is absolutely stupid! Basically, they have not understood the idea: "Bhagwan" is a state of experience -- nothing to do with an appointment, an election, a title or degree. It is the experience of bhagwata, of godliness, that the whole existence is full of godliness, that there is nothing other than godliness.
There is no God, but in every flower and in every tree, in every stone, there is something which can only be called godliness. But you can see it only when you have seen it within yourself; otherwise you don't know the language.
"Bhagwan" is simply a state of being, the highest state of being; you cannot go beyond it.
The second confusion in the critics has been because they don't understand that in India there are three religions.

Hinduism uses "Bhagwan" for God. Buddhism uses "Bhagwan" for godliness, Jainism uses "Bhagwan" for godliness -- they don't have any God, both the religions are godless.

But Buddhists for centuries have been calling Gautam Buddha "Bhagwan," and Jainas have been calling Mahavira "Bhagwan." And very strange -- nobody has objected that "you don't have a god in your philosophy, then how can you call Buddha a god, or Mahavira a god? It has not been raised because neither Buddha nor Mahavir ever claimed themselves to be God; they simply said that they have experienced godliness.

Now, it is a state -- and even if I want to drop it, I cannot drop it. It is me.

I dissolved the organization that was becoming a religion. I allowed my sannyasins the freedom to choose their clothes, to have a mala or not to have a mala; and now it is more beautiful. If you have a mala, it is your choice; if you are using red clothes, it is your choice. It is nothing imposed on you, it is not against your will.

It was easy to drop the organization because I have always been against organizations. It was created while I was in silence, it was not created by me. I told you to burn the book of Rajneeshism because it was not written by me; I have never written anything.

It was in my silence that people collected my sayings from here and there according to their understanding, and mixed them with their own ideas to create something equal to other religions' holy books.

I told you to burn all the books.

Red clothes don't mean anything -- they were used as a device. I wanted my people to be courageous enough to stand in society -- aloof, alone. I had given them the mala so that they become associated with me, they become associated with all my ideas, which are against all religions, all political ideologies. That point has been made. Now my sannyasins are around the world.

It is perfectly easy to drop the color, the mala -- there is no problem. Now you have to be more...

I have not made things easier for you, remember -- I have made things difficult. Now only meditation remains for you.

And now, only through meditation will you be recognized as sannyasins.

Meditation has to change you so much that you become a different species, that even in a crowd my sannyasins can be picked out. They will have a radiation of their own, a silence of their own, a peace of their own. Their eyes will show it, their bodies will show it, their gestures will show it.

Meditation I cannot drop because that is what is going to transform you and bring you one day to bhagwata, godliness. Meditation is the way to godliness.

It is impossible for me to drop "Bhagwan." If it was a title it would be very easy to drop it. If it was anything other than an experience, an existential state, it would be possible to drop it. It is impossible to drop it because now there is no distinction between me and it, so who is going to drop whom?

Secondly, even if it was possible to drop, I would not drop it. In your question you say, "because many people are

prevented because of it." That is the reason why I will not drop it: I don't want those people to come to me who cannot come to me just because of a word. And for what do they need to come to me? In India there are nine hundred million people who are not Bhagwan -- they can go to them.
Why do they come, or think of coming, to me? It is strange that they can go anywhere -- everywhere they will find millions of people who are not Bhagwan and they can enjoy meeting them. If they want to meet me, they want to meet me because of "Bhagwan."
But their ego is hurt. I will not drop it because I want them to understand that it is their ego that is hurt. If they want to come; they will have to drop their ego.
They will have to drop their ego. I have not to change myself for them to come to me -- they will have to change themselves if they want to come to me. I don't need them to come to me, I have no necessity. It is their desire to come to me, so they should pay for it.
It is a very strange demand, that I should change myself because they want to meet me; they should change themselves if they want to meet me.

Light on the Path
Chapter #4
Chapter title: Darkness: the substance existence is made of
31 December 1985 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,

WHAT DO YOU HAVE TO SAY ABOUT DARKNESS?

I have much to say about darkness, because nobody has taken notice of the mystery that darkness is.
Much has been said about light, almost nothing about darkness. But darkness is a much deeper phenomenon than light is. Light comes and goes -- darkness remains; it never comes, it never goes. Light is not eternal, because it needs fuel, some kind of fuel, and the fuel will be exhausted sooner or later. Darkness needs no fuel, no cause; hence darkness is not an effect and can remain eternally there.
In the morning, you see the sun arises and there is light; in the evening the sun sets, the light disappears, and suddenly all over there is darkness. It does not mean that when the sun disappears, darkness comes in. It has been there all the time; just because of the light you could not see it. How can one see darkness while light is there? The light prevented your vision.
So anytime just close your eyes and darkness is there.
Anytime just blow out the candle and
darkness is there.
Gautam Buddha is perhaps the only man who, for the ultimate state of consciousness, has chosen a word which can be interpreted as darkness; otherwise all the religions have talked about light, forgetting completely that light is not eternal, and if you are light, you are also not eternal. Light is dependent on something, it is caused by something. Gautam Buddha has called his ultimate state of being, nirvana. Even Buddhists have not thought of it as darkness, because the very word produces bad associations in us. But nirvana means exactly "darkness"; literally it means

blowing out the candle. So for twenty-five centuries Buddhists have been using the literal meaning "blowing out the candle." But what does it mean? Blowing out the candle, what remains then? Eternal, deathless, abysmal darkness.

Feeling yourself full of light may be again an ego trip. Feeling yourself identified with light, you may be simply changing your identity -- but the ego remains. But blowing out the candle is blowing away the ego; and the vast darkness is bound to create in you a similar vastness of humility, humbleness, egolessness. So I love the word.

I always see light as a disturbance, and darkness as silence. But centuries of continuously fearing darkness... because it became associated with the time when man was living in jungles. The night was the most dangerous time. In the day somehow he managed to protect himself from the wild animals; he managed to kill them for his own food. But in the night he was absolutely helpless. Darkness all around, he was a victim. Any animal was capable of destroying him. In the day he could have managed to escape, to climb a tree or do something, but in darkness he was simply in the hands of wild death. So it was very easy to get a deep association between darkness and death.

All the religions depict death as darkness and life as light. It is simply the experience of man in the past when he lived in the jungles. That experience has molded his language, given it meanings. And he has not yet been able to clean those words again -- because now he is not living in jungles, but still there is a certain reason why he continues to be afraid of darkness.

When there is light you are not alone, you can see everybody else. If suddenly the light goes off, the others may be there still, may not be; one thing is certain, you feel lonely. You are no more associated with the crowd. The crowd gives you a certain security, safety, a certain warmth, and you feel that you are not alone. Any danger -- so many people are with you. But in darkness suddenly you are lonely, nobody is with you.

And man has not learned yet to know the beauties of his loneliness. He is always hankering for some relationship, to be with someone -- with a friend, with a father, with a wife, with a husband, with a child... with someone.

He has created societies, he has created clubs -- the Lion's Club, the Rotary Club. He has created parties -- political, ideological. He has created religions, churches. But the basic need of all is to forget somehow that you are alone. Being associated with so many crowds, you are trying to forget something which in darkness suddenly is remembered -- that you were born alone, that you will die alone, that whatever you do, you live alone. Aloneness is something so essential to your being, there is no way to avoid it.

You can befool yourself and deceive yourself; you can pretend that you are not alone -- you have a wife, you have children, you have friends -- but it is all pretension. You know and everybody knows that the wife is alone as much as you are alone, and two alonenesses joined together do not change the situation; instead they make it worse.

As I see it, why lovers are continuously fighting -- there may be thousand other reasons, but those reasons are superficial. The basic reason is that they had chosen the

other as a beloved, as a lover, to destroy their loneliness -- and it has not happened. On the contrary, the presence of the other makes them more aware of their loneliness.

I used to have a very rich friend -- he had a beautiful wife, children... all that one needs, perfectly comfortable, so much so that when I asked him, "Now you are fifty, and you have enough money -- retire from the businesses," he did not hesitate for a single moment. He just informed people that he is no more an active participant in any businesses, he has retired.

I was going to Mount Abu; I told him, "It is a beautiful place -- "sometime you and your wife should go there. And now you are retired, you have enough time. Be there for a few weeks or months."

He said, "You are right, we have time, but you don't know what you have done to me. I was also thinking that when I am retired I will feel relaxed for the first time in my life. My father died when I was young, and since then I have been working continuously, becoming richer and richer. And I had a hope that one day I will retire and relax and will not have any worries of the world. And when you told me, `Now it is time -- you have enough.... What more do you need? Your girls are married, you don't have a son -- for whom are you earning now? You may live twenty years, thirty years -- for that you have too much. You could live with what you have for three hundred years. You retire!'"

He said, "I understood, because I have been deep down always hoping to retire, and when it came from you, I said, `This is the moment to take the jump.' But you have created a trouble; now I am lonely. I have never felt it before. And

I am so utterly lonely that I am angry at you. How can I relax in such loneliness? And if this loneliness continues, I don't think I can survive twenty or thirty years. It is becoming colder and colder, and darker and darker. And I am feeling absolutely cut off from the world."

"But," I said, "you have your wife."

He said, "That is another trouble. I had never felt so lonely in her presence as I feel now. I was so busy in my businesses that I would come home late and she was always quarreling, nagging, asking for this and asking for that. There was no time to feel each other. Now the whole day I am sitting at home, and when I see her I know: just as I am alone, she is alone. And two alonenesses do not help in any way; on the contrary they make each other more clear."

He said, "I will come to Mount Abu, but I would like some friend to be with us; otherwise three weeks or three months, just living with my wife" -- and he loved the woman -- "will be too much, intolerable."

I realized his situation and I told him, "Now, you have listened to my first advice which has created the trouble for you; but it has not created the trouble -- the trouble was already there. Your businesses were just keeping you occupied so you were not aware of it -- now you are aware of it. Now take my other advice: go deeper into it rather than escaping. It is your reality -- there is no way to escape from it.

"It is just like your shadow -- the faster you run, the faster your shadow runs. Wherever you go, the shadow goes. It is simply stupid to fight with the shadow. Rather, sit silently and let the whole feel of being alone envelop you. In the beginning it may be fearsome. You may feel you are falling

into an abysmal depth. It will be dark, and you may feel that it may become darker if you go deeper into it.
"But I say from my own experience that the more you know it, the more you love it. It is your privacy, it is your individuality. It is something which cannot be trespassed by anyone. It is your privilege. And there is nothing wrong in being alone.
"But never use the word `lonely' because `lonely' automatically suggests the need for somebody else. `Lonely' is a sick word. Use the word `alone'; `alone' has a health of its own." I told the man, "And if you can do that then there is no need for any other meditation, this will be your meditation -- just be alone. Even in the crowd remember that you are alone, don't forget it. Your whole life you have tried to forget it; now remember it."
The man was immensely courageous. He tried it -- he succeeded, and he was immensely grateful to me... because the moment you feel you are absolutely alone, that is the time you start feeling that you are not the body, it is only a cover; that you are not the mind, it is only a mechanism; that you are not even the heart -- that too is a mechanism of a different sort for different purposes.
Behind all these layers there is a space, crystal clear -- nobody else has ever passed through it; its purity is absolute. To enter that space is to enter in meditation. Feeling that aloneness, you will feel the whole existence is alone.
There is no God -- that was the need of the lonely people. Those who have tasted aloneness have discarded God, hell, heaven, and every other nonsense. You are alone, the whole existence is alone: aloneness is the only reality.

Yes, it is immensely dark, but darkness has a silence and darkness has a depth. And darkness has peace, and darkness takes away all your knowledge, takes away everything that you thought belonged to you. It leads you absolutely into the unknown and into the mysterious. So to me, darkness is one of the greatest mysteries in existence -- far greater than light.
And those who are afraid of darkness will never be able to enter into their own being. They will go round and round, they will never reach themselves.
And it has to be darkness, not light, because light comes and goes; once you have discovered the spot of darkness in you, you have discovered something that is eternal, something indestructible, something which is more than what you know of life. It is the basic substance existence is made of. But they are just two names of one thing -- aloneness or darkness.

Question 2
BELOVED OSHO,
MORE THAN ANYTHING ELSE I WANT YOUR VISION TO HAPPEN. WHEN I AM NOT WITH YOU, AND I AM OUT IN THE WORLD, ALONE, WHAT PART CAN I PLAY IN HELPING YOUR VISION TO HAPPEN?

Just be yourself, utterly yourself.
And never think in terms of how you can help my vision to happen in the world, because that's what makes a missionary -- and I am against missionaries. They are the poisoners. Their intention is good, they want to spread

something which they feel is immensely valuable, but a missionary does not know that what he is trying to spread is not his own experience.

So I would like to make it clear that you just be yourself, and that will be the way of spreading my message to people, because that's my message -- to be yourself authentically, sincerely. It is not a question of saying something to somebody; it is a question of being somebody in a way that the vision radiates from you... that the people feel that something has happened to you that has not happened to them... that there is something in you that they are missing... that you are full and they are empty... that you can give and yet you will not be losing anything. And they are only beggars; they cannot give, they can only take. And whatsoever they take also disappears soon because it is not their own.

I would not like my people to be like Christian missionaries.

I was in an American jail one morning... the jailer must have been a very fanatic Christian, and he came with a BIBLE, thinking that I am a religious man. And he said, "I would like to pray for you and I would like to present God's word to you." And before I could say anything, he started praying for me loudly, with closed eyes: "Jesus loves Bhagwan, Jesus will help Bhagwan. Jesus will save Bhagwan."

I said, "Wait! You have gone too far!"

He opened his eyes; and he said, "Have I said anything wrong?"

I said, "Everything wrong... because Jesus could not save himself! And you are putting everything wrong: `Jesus

loves Bhagwan.' That's not right. Put it: `Bhagwan loves Jesus, and Bhagwan will save Jesus.'"
He said, "I have prayed for many prisoners -- what are you saying? You are in jail, you need to be saved."
I said , "I am not in any difficulty. This whole world is a jail, so what difference does it make whether you are outside or inside? And you don't understand anything of religiousness -- you did not even ask my permission to pray for me.
"A prayer is trespassing my being. And to whom are you praying? I don't have any god, so all your prayers are just stupid. And I don't think that Jesus or anybody else can save anybody else. It is enough if you can save yourself. Without asking me you started praying! And who told you that this book is the word of God?"
He said, "It is written in the book itself."
I said, "But it is written in so many other books too. It is written in the VEDAS, and Hindus believe the VEDAS are written by God. It is written in the GITA because Hindus believe it is spoken by the perfect incarnation of God himself. Mohammedans believe the KORAN is the word of God.
"What criterion have you got to choose which one is right? And I can write a book in which I can say, `These are the words spoken by God.' Just because it's printed, will you believe it?"
He was silent for a moment, and then he said, "I will think it over and I will come back to you. Because I used to think... I am a missionary and I always have five hundred prisoners in the jail, changing every day. So I have been preaching and helping them becoming real Christians."

I said, "Are you a real Christian? Was Jesus Christ himself a real Christian? What do you mean by `real Christian?' Jesus never behaved like a Christian. He was a very angry man. He teaches to love your enemy -- and he curses a fig tree which is out of season. And it is not the fault of fig tree that it has no fruits! And he curses it in a very ugly way because it has not welcomed him and his disciples with fruits.

"Now, what can the fig tree do about it? And this man you think is a Christian, and this man you think can love his enemies! He cannot even be loving to a fig tree which has not done any harm to anybody. And the fruits come only in the season and it is not the season, so it is not the tree's fault. This man is insane!

"And you are spreading his word. Have you tried to live his word? That would be the right way -- live it! When somebody hits you on one cheek, give him the other cheek. Should I try," I asked him, "hitting you on one cheek, and will you give me the other cheek? And I would like to do it before all five hundred prisoners."

He said, "You are a dangerous man!"

I said, "I am not a dangerous man, I am simply saying that to be a missionary is something ugly. You are trying to interfere in somebody's being, his thought processes, his existence, without ever trying all that you want others to be on yourself. And my feeling is, if you try it on yourself, there is no need to spread it -- it will spread on its own."

So I would like to say: Just be yourself. Be meditative, be loving, be human, be respectful, be accepting of everybody; don't be judgmental. And something will start radiating from you, and that will be my word. And it will not be just

an empty word, it will be full of meaning and full of fragrance.

Question 3
BELOVED OSHO,
WHEN I AM FAR AWAY FROM YOU, I OFTEN FEEL VERY CLOSE. AND WHEN I SEE YOU AGAIN, I AM SOMETIMES STARTLED TO FIND US ALMOST STRANGERS. HOW CAN THIS BE?

It is very simple to feel close when you are far away, because then I am not present to you; it is only your own imagination about me. And naturally you are very close to your imagination, and you can make that imagination the way you want. You can make it according to your ideas -- it is your imagination -- and you are bound to be very close. But when you come to me, you will have to drop your imagination. And the moment you drop your imagination immediately the second feeling will arise: "Perhaps we are strangers." You were not a stranger to your imagination; it was yours. To me you are a stranger. We are all strangers to each other.
We try in every way to drop this strangeness; that's how we have created all kinds of rituals. One man gets married to a woman.... What is marriage? -- just a ritual. But why? -- because they want to drop that strangeness and somehow create a bridge. The bridge is never created; they only imagine... now that one is husband, the other is wife. But they remain strangers. Their whole life they will live together but they will not be anything else than strangers, because nobody can penetrate into the other's aloneness.

You can be not a stranger only if you can penetrate into my aloneness or I can penetrate into your aloneness -- which is not possible, not existentially possible. We can come as close as possible; but the closer we come, the more we will become aware of the strangeness, because the better we will be able to see, that "The other is unknown to me -- and perhaps unknowable."

It is a known fact: you fall in love with a man; you don't fall in love with the real man, you fall in love with the man of your imagination. And while you are not together, and you see the man from your balcony, or you meet the man on the sea beach for a few minutes, or you hold hands in a movie, you start feeling, "We are made for each other." But nobody is made for each other. You go on putting more and more imagination on the man -- unconsciously. You create a certain aura around the man; he creates a certain aura around you. Everything seems to be beautiful because you are making it beautiful, because you are dreaming it, avoiding the reality. And you both are trying in every possible way not to disturb the other's imagination.

So the woman is behaving the way the man wants her to behave; the man is behaving the way the woman wants him to behave. But this you can do only for few minutes or few hours at the most. Once you get married and you have to live together twenty-four hours a day, it becomes a heavy burden to go on pretending something that you are not. Just to fulfill the imagination of the man or the woman, how long can you go on acting? Sooner or later it becomes a burden and you start taking revenge. You start destroying all that imagination that the man has created around you

because you don't want to be imprisoned in it; you want to be free and just yourself.

And the same is the situation with the man: he wants to be free and just himself. And this is the constant conflict between all lovers, all relations.

The reality is, we are alone, we are strangers, and the world will be far better if we accept the basic truth that we are strangers.

And what is wrong in falling in love with a stranger? What is the need that before you fall in love with a stranger, the strangeness should be destroyed? His caste should be known, his nationality should be known, his religion should be known, his astrology should be known -- when he was born, the date of birth, the time of his birth. All these are efforts to destroy the strangeness, and to create some kind of illusion that you are not strangers.

But no illusion can stand against reality. The reality is going to crush it sooner or later.

So remember: away, you can think about me the way you want, because my reality is not going to give any trouble to you -- your imagination is free. But when you are with me, then you have to put your imagination away, and without imagination, immediately we are strangers.

We may have known each other's name, we may have seen each other's face many times -- that does not matter. Our beings are so hidden and so deep that there is no way that I can touch anybody's being, or can see anybody's being -- and that is where the whole strangeness is. But I don't feel that it is a catastrophe; on the contrary I feel it is a blessing. If we were not strangers we would have been just robots, just machines. Our strangeness gives us individuality,

uniqueness. And because it is impenetrable it gives you your strength, your dignity.
But humanity has lived with illusions of all kinds in every sphere.
My effort is to help you to live without illusions, to live with reality as it is.
Then you will not be frustrated, then you will not be miserable, then you will not be tense and worried, because you had from the very beginning accepted the fact that everybody is a stranger.
The society does not like strangers. The society wants everybody to be just like everybody else, because the society is afraid of the stranger. Even people casually meeting -- for example in a train....
I was traveling for twenty years continuously; once in a while there was another passenger in the coupe. The first thing the person will start asking, "What is your name, where are you coming from, where are you going, what is your business?" I was surprised: why should one bother about these things? So I started... before the person will ask. I will enter, I will say, "This is my name and this is my father's name and this is my father's father's name, and this is my business, and this is where I am coming from and this is where I am going..." And the man will feel a little afraid. He will say, "But why you are telling me?"
I will say, "Because you will ask sooner or later. Let it be finished. Have you any more questions? -- because after this I am going to remain silent. For twenty-four hours we will be together, so I have said everything that you wanted to know."

And then I will be silent, just watching the man. And it would be such a beautiful experience! He will be fidgety, tossing and turning, opening the suitcase -- for no reason. He would know, I would know, that there is no reason. Then closing it, then trying to read a book -- which he is not reading, just looking. Then putting it away, then calling the servant, then going to the bathroom, then coming up.... Just something is disturbing him: a very strange man has entered. You had not asked his name, and he tells all the names of his fathers and grandfathers and what they did and how many brothers they have and how many brothers he has and how many sisters, and who is married and who is not married....

The stranger has become more strange by this introduction. And now he is sitting silently watching you and you have to do something; otherwise it looks stupid -- just sitting there and.... I would go out and tell the conductor, "Soon that other person will call you and say that he wants to change the seat to another compartment. You have to tell him that no seat is vacant."

And I was traveling so much that almost all conductors knew me. They said, "But why again and again do you disturb people so much? Now we know that for twenty-four hours he is in trouble. He cannot sleep, he cannot sit, he cannot do anything!"

I said, "Let him learn something." And actually that is what he will do. He will ring the bell, call the conductor, and tell him that he wants to change the room. And the conductor will say, "There is no other seat vacant, this is the only seat. But why do you want to change?" That he cannot say: why he wants to change.

"Has the other passenger disturbed you? Or has he done anything to you, touched your body or anything?"
He said, "He has not done anything, but just to be here feels very strange."
People meeting each other try to make some bridges; otherwise it is difficult.
Once it happened in Bombay, I entered the compartment -- one man was there already and he saw that hundreds of people had come to see me off, so I must be a Hindu saint, because those people outside all look like Hindus. So he simply fell at my feet.
I helped him to stand up and I said, "You have done something wrong. I am a Mohammedan."
He said, "Mohammedan? And I have touched your feet!"
I said, "You didn't give me any chance -- you immediately jumped and touched my feet!"
"No," he said. "No, you are not a Mohammedan, you must be joking!"
"Why should I be joking? Do you think religion is a joke? It is not a joke, it is a serious affair. This is a serious affair."
He said, "But the people who had come to see you were all Hindus."
I said, "Yes, I have a great Hindu following too. But you can see my face is Mohammedan."
He said, "Perhaps. But now I will have to take a bath, because I am a brahmin, Bengali brahmin; and I have not even touched a Mohammedan in my life -- and I have touched your feet!"
I said, "If a bath is needed, you take a bath." And he took a bath and he came out. And I said, "I was just joking! -- I am really a Hindu saint. But what kind of brahmin are you

that you cannot recognize a Hindu saint?" And he touched my feet again, and I told him, "Now you will have to take the bath again!"
And the man said, "You will drive me crazy. Why don't you say who you really are?"
I said, "Really if you ask, I don't know, because when I was born I had not come with any identification -- whether I am Hindu or Mohammedan or Christian -- so as far as reality is concerned, I don't know. But as far as social conditionings are concerned, I am a Mohammedan." And it was a cold night, and he had to go and take another bath!
And the conductor came to me and said, "This is too much! That man will die. You will have to keep him taking baths the whole night...."
And I said, "I will not keep him, I will do many other things. But why, in the first place, should he bother to touch my feet? -- I had not asked him."
And he came back, repeating a mantra and trying to avoid looking at me. I said, "Don't avoid! I had to force you to take two baths, because I allow people only to touch my feet after two baths. I am not an ordinary saint."
He said, "My God! Then why did you not tell me before? I would have taken two baths before and would not have gone into such agony that I had been touching the feet of a Mohammedan!"
I said, "Now you can touch them." But he was hesitant. I said, "If you are hesitant, don't touch because it is a question of faith. If you have real faith, and you are a real brahmin, only then can you touch."

He said, "I am a real brahmin and I have faith, and I had faith in you from the very beginning; I had touched your feet, and I am going to touch -- and he touched my feet. And I laughed. He said, "Why are you laughing?"
I said, "Don't ask; otherwise you will have to take a third bath, and the night is too cold. You just cover yourself with a blanket and go to sleep."
He said, "You will kill me!"
I said, "I am not doing anything; I am simply sitting here. It is you who are doing all these things -- touching my feet, taking a bath. Why are you bothered with me?"
I have experienced thousands of times that people are trying to figure out who you are. That gives them a certain kind of solace that you are not a stranger: you are a Hindu, you are a Mohammedan, you are a brahmin.... That gives a certain consolation that something is known about you. But the reality is that nobody is a brahmin, and nobody is a Mohammedan, nobody is a Hindu. And it is not that I am a stranger to you; everybody is a stranger to everybody else. It is our imagination that creates all kinds of ideas about people. Sooner or later they are disturbed. Against the reality, they cannot stand.
So your question is exactly the description of reality. Far away you can feel me very close, very much known, because that is just the figment of your imagination. Close to me it is impossible. You will have to be absolutely certain that all imagination is dropped and you look at me, whatever the case -- whether it turns out to be a stranger.... It is going to turn out to be a stranger.
But my experience is, it is one of the beauties of life that we are all strangers and there is no way to change this

reality. It is beautiful to have strangers love you, to have strangers your friends, to have strangers all around the world. Then the whole world becomes a mystery -- it is a mystery. Our mind is continuously trying to demystify it, but the mind cannot succeed. Against reality there is no way to succeed. And it is good that the mind's failure is recognized, so even when you are far away, you don't allow your imagination and mind to play games with you. You don't start dreaming, you remain clear that strangeness is nature. All that we can do is apply labels.

There was one very famous man in India, Mahatma Bhagwandin. There were only two people in India who were called mahatmas; Gandhi and Bhagwandin. Mahatma means the great soul.

He loved me very much. He used to stay with me whenever he passed my town. He was a very knowledgeable man. He was very old, must be seventy-five, eighty... very knowledgeable -- a great scholar in many ways about strange things you would never think....

I would take him for a morning walk, and he would start describing every flower -- its name, its Latin name, its qualities, its medicinal use... anything. And he was so full of all these things that he would destroy my morning walk. So I told him, "Do you think by knowing the Latin name of the flower you know the flower? Do you think by knowing its medicinal use you know the flower? Do you think a poet looking at this flower will think of the Latin name and its medicinal use? Do you think a painter looking at this flower will think of anything other than colors? And even if you know the Latin name and you know the colors, and you know the medicinal use and you know everything possible

about the flower, still the flower remains an unknown reality; it is mysterious.

"Just its being there is mysterious. Its fragrance is mysterious. Why it exists, why existence needs it, we don't know. There must be some necessity it fulfills; without it, existence will be a little less, incomplete. We can never know the relationship of the flower with existence, and that is its reality. That will always remain a strange phenomenon. But why not leave it as strange?"

It is said that once Picasso was painting on the seashore. For two hours a man was watching him paint -- two hours is a long time to watch somebody paint. Finally he ran out of patience; he asked Picasso, "I did not mean to disturb you -- for two hours I have been waiting for the moment when you will put the brush down for a moment, and I can ask just one question: `What is it that you are painting?' In two hours I have not been able to figure it out."

Picasso said, "This is strange! Nobody asks nature, `Why did you make these mountains, why did you make this ocean? What does it mean? Why do you go on making so many birds, so many flowers, so many people? What it is all about?' And I am a poor painter -- just on a small canvas I am doing my own thing, and the whole world is on my head asking, `What does it mean?' Why should it mean anything?"

The man said, "I did not want to offend you."

Picasso said, "I don't feel offended, I simply feel that people think everything has a meaning, everything has to be known. I don't know what it is, but I loved painting it. I still don't know what it is, but I am immensely happy that I have painted it. It was within me for days; all these colors

that I have spread on the canvas have been in me. I don't know why, but I don't want to know either."
And that is a significant point to understand: why should we be concerned about knowing each other?
When I was in the university they used to have `Getting-to-know-you' meetings once or twice a year. I never went there. The vice-chancellor said to me, "You never come to the `Getting-to-know-you' meetings." I said, "Because one thing is certain for me, that nothing can be known. So all that nonsense that you call `Getting-to-know-you' is just a waste of time. I go into the hills, I go to the river -- which is far better. What is this need to know each other? What are you going to know?"
In this sense I respect the poets, the painters, the musicians, the dancers. You cannot ask a dancer, "What does it mean?" You can enjoy it, you can love it, you may start dancing with him, but you cannot ask, "What does it mean?"
It remains a mystery, and the best in art, the best in music, the best in literature, the best in philosophy, the best in religion -- all are mysteries.
And I want to bring to my sannyasins all of life's mysteries.

Light on the Path

Chapter #5

Chapter title: The strength you feel is the strength of truth
31 December 1985 pm in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1

BELOVED OSHO,
YOU ARE AT ONCE SUCH AN INCREDIBLE STRENGTH AND SWEETNESS SEEPING THROUGH ME. WHY DO I FEEL THERE IS A NEED TO PROTECT YOU?

It is one of the fundamental laws of life that everything that is higher is very vulnerable. The roots of a tree are very strong, but not the flowers. The flowers are very vulnerable -- just a strong breeze and the flower may be destroyed. The same is true about human consciousness. Hate is very strong, but love is not. Love is just like a flower -- easily crushed by any stone, destroyed by any animal. And as you reach higher into consciousness, the ultimate blossoming which we call enlightenment is the most vulnerable thing in the whole of existence.
So you will feel love, you will feel my compassion, and you will feel behind each of my words and gestures, strength. That strength is coming because whatever I am saying and whatever I am, it is my own experience. I am my own authority; I am not within quotation marks.
The strength that you feel is the strength of truth.
The flower dancing in the wind does not look weak. In the sun, in the rain, it looks immensely strong. So these two sides which seem contradictory to each other are not contradictory to each other. The strength comes to the flower because it has roots in the earth, its own roots. The strength comes to the flower because the juice that is flowing in it is its own juice. The flower has not borrowed it from anybody, it is authentically itself.

And it can dance in the wind, in the rain, in the sun; but on the other hand, because the flower is the highest expression of the tree, it is vulnerable. Even with all its strength, you can destroy it very easily.

Just imagine Socrates speaking to the people of Athens. His strength behind each word is tremendous: a man alone against the whole world. But there is no weakness. He is not afraid. Even the judges are affected by the strength, because anybody who is speaking a borrowed truth cannot have such authority.

To the chief judge Socrates says, "You can kill me, but remember one thing: your name will be remembered in history for just one thing -- that you decided to kill Socrates; otherwise you have nothing to contribute. And all these judges and all these people who are going to decide about me will be forgotten as if they had never existed. You can kill me, but you cannot kill my spirit."

They decided to kill him, but they were certainly impressed because they could not give any counter-argument; and whatever he said was so clear, so truthful, there was no way to put him in the wrong -- he remained always in the right in court. Still, it was a democracy -- truth was being decided by a majority. And the idiots who made the majority may not have even understood what Socrates was saying; it may have gone above their heads.

Perhaps because of that reason itself, they decided that he should be killed by giving poison, as was the custom in Greece. They could not tolerate such a man, who was so far above them and so much higher than themselves. His beauty, his truth, his sincerity -- all were making them feel

inferior. He was stronger than the whole crowd that was going to decide his fate.

You can see the strength. The judges were affected by the strength. They had to concede to the majority but they made a few conditions, just to help Socrates. They said, "If the majority decides to kill you by giving poison, we cannot do anything. But we can suggest a few alternatives -- that is within our powers. One is that you can leave Athens and promise that you will not return."

Socrates says, "That is impossible, because wherever I am, I will be faced with the same situation." And Athens in those days was at the peak of culture, education, civilization. Perhaps no city has ever been at such a peak. "If Athens cannot tolerate me, I don't think there is another city which is ready to tolerate me.

"If you are throwing me out, who is going to welcome me? And I don't want to leave Athens -- I love it, and I love its youth, and I love the few intelligent people in this city who have been able to understand me. I don't care about the crowd, I care about those selected people with whom I have a certain heart-to-heart communion. No, I cannot leave Athens. That will be worse than death."

The judges said, "The second alternative is that you can remain in Athens, but you stop speaking, you stop teaching."

Socrates, for the first time in the whole trial, laughed. He said, "You are asking more and more absurd things. What is Socrates without his teaching? What is Socrates without his truth? That's my life and my being. Please don't try to be kind to me -- death is more respectful than to concede

to, and compromise with, anything that goes against my heart." He accepted death. The alternatives were available. Certainly there is a strength, a tremendous strength in the man. But just a glass of poison kills the man, because the poison does not take any note of who you are -- an idiot or a Socrates. Faced with poison he proves to be very vulnerable.

So these two things are not contradictory.

You feel my love, you feel my strength -- it is there. I can stand against the whole world... in fact that's what I have been doing my whole life. But those who have hearts will certainly feel my vulnerability. Just a bullet is enough. It won't see whether it is killing an animal, an idiot, or a buddha.

So the idea to protect me arises in your heart from the second possibility. All my sannyasins feel exactly the same. They feel both -- they feel my strength and they feel my vulnerability. And all my sannyasins around the earth are in the same dilemma you are: "When there is so much strength in the man, what is the need for us to be worried about protecting him?"

The strength is coming from one source, and the danger of destroying such a man is coming from a different source. There is no contradiction in it.

And it is natural for the sannyasins to feel immensely protective towards me, for the simple reason that they know the light of a candle is strong enough to fill the whole room with light, but it is so vulnerable: just a small breeze from the window may put it out.

There is no contradiction in it. Both are coming from different sources.

Question 2
BELOVED OSHO,
WASHING YOUR CLOTHES, COOKING YOUR FOOD, HELPING THOSE WHO COME TO YOU WITH QUESTIONS, SPREADING YOUR WORDS TO THE FAR CORNERS OF THE WORLD, YEARNING FROM THOUSANDS OF MILES AWAY FOR JUST A GLIMPSE OF YOU -- WHY ARE THESE THINGS SO DEAR?
WHY IS THE MYSTERY OF THIS NIGHT SKY FILLED WITH YOU SO PRECIOUS?

The moment you feel something authentic in a world which is absolutely insincere; the moment you feel something as pure love in a world where even love is polluted, where you cannot find anything that is worthy for human beings.... And suddenly you come across a man who seems to be coming from another world, talking another language, showing ways to reach to faraway stars, making every effort to help you for no motivation, just because he enjoys helping people to reach the stars.
Naturally to do any small thing for such a man makes you feel a great joy. What you are doing does not matter.
I am reminded of an incident in Gautam Buddha's life. His cousin-brother who was older than him wanted to be initiated, but he said to Gautam Buddha, "Listen Siddhartha" -- that was his family name -- "before I take initiation I want to put a few conditions on you, because once I am initiated, then I cannot say anything to you: then you are the master and I am simply a shadow. So it has to

be decided before initiation because right now I am your elder brother, and you are my younger brother." And traditionally in India the elder should be respected.
So Buddha asked, "What are your conditions?"
He said, "Not very big... very small. One, that I will be always with you. So you will not be able to tell me after initiation that, `Ananda, you go to a certain place to spread the word -- travel.' No, I am going to be with you, so you have to remember it after initiation.
"This is absolute... because I want to wash your clothes, I want to take care of your body, I want to massage your feet after the whole day's walking from one village to another. I want to take care that you are getting the right food, enough food. I want to take care that on cold nights you are not cold; that on hot days you are not in a space which is hot. Just small things.... I am not asking this for me.
"Secondly, whenever I want somebody to meet you, you cannot refuse. It may be in the middle of the night... and that too is not for me, because I know there are people who come from thousands of miles with great love just to touch your feet, just to listen to a word from you, just to see you to believe that such a man really exists. I cannot refuse. Your guardians look very cruel to me.
"And thirdly, whenever you are talking with somebody I will be constantly present there. Nobody can say that he wants to meet you alone. And this is also not for me, because I know that the more you become known to the world -- the more you are gathering friends and lovers -- you are also creating enemies.
"I don't want to leave you alone, because who knows? -- the man may not be a friend. And you are so vulnerable

that anybody can kill you very easily. To follow you is very difficult, to kill you is very easy; because in following you one has to kill one's own ego -- which is a difficult task -- but to kill you... a fragile man, so delicate: I will not leave you alone in privacy with anybody, without exception."
When an elder brother asks these things -- or anything -- in India, the younger simply accepts. And a man like Buddha simply laughed. He said, "That's perfectly okay. Your conditions are accepted."
Only once, just one time in his whole life of forty-two years with Ananda, Buddha had to ask him to relax just a little bit about one condition, because he had gone back to the palace which he had left twelve years before, and he wanted to see his wife.
"And I know her -- she is a very proud woman. In front of you not even a single tear will come from her eyes. And she will welcome me as if I had just gone the other day for some business. But for twelve years she must have been boiling, angry. Not that I left her... because I know her perfectly. Her anger is not that, it cannot be.
"I know her quality. She comes from a warrior family where every girl is taught that one day the husband has to go to war: then tears should not come to your eyes; then you should not be a hindrance. Then you should touch his feet and help him to go completely at ease that he is not leaving behind a weeping, crying wife.
"So it is not a question that I left her, the question, I know perfectly well, is that I did not say it to her, that I did not trust her. That will be her wound; and your presence will not allow her to open up whatsoever in twelve years, she has gathered about me."

Ananda said, "I can understand -- and I can make an exception."

And actually that's what happened. The moment Buddha went in to see his wife, the first thing she said was, "I am not disturbed by your search for truth -- it is really my pride that my husband is a seeker of truth, that he has dedicated his whole life to it. But one thing hurts: why did you not tell me? Do you think I would have prevented you?

"Do you think me so uncultured that I will prevent my own husband who is going on a pilgrimage in search of truth? That's the only thing I cannot forgive and cannot forget. These twelve years that wound has been there, that you did not trust me. And I was worried that Ananda, your constant companion, would be with you, and I may not be able to say this -- because he is not only your elder brother, he is also my elder brother because of your relationship. I could not have said it. It is very compassionate of you that you have come alone."

The day Buddha left, his son was only one day old. He was born just twenty-four hours before. The wife brought the son -- now he was twelve years old -- and said, "He consistently insists on seeing his father, how he looks, why the whole world is mad about him -- either for or against -- and why he does not come home. Now, this is your son, and I want you to give him an inheritance. What inheritance have you to give to your son?"

Buddha had only his begging bowl. And he gave it to his son, whose name was Rahul, and initiated him into sannyas.

His wife finally burst into tears, fell at his feet, and she said, "Only you can do it. What strength you have! You left

me without saying a word, you left me with a child who was only twenty-four hours old. And now as an inheritance you are giving your begging bowl to the child! No father has done this ever. You are making him a beggar! But it makes me happy to have such a strong man.

"Please initiate me also, and initiate your father also -- he is old and for twelve years he has been waiting for you. He is very angry. You are his only son. Who is going to take over the throne after him? So please don't take any note of what he says -- he loves you. But he will be angry, he will shout at you."

Buddha said, "Don't be worried about that. I know him."

And his father shouted and was very angry, and he said, "You betrayed us!"

And Buddha listened silently. When his father was finished, Buddha said only one thing: "Please just look into my eyes, into my face. Do you think I am the same man who left this palace? You are angry with somebody else! And you are unnecessarily throwing all your anger on me. I am not the same man -- that man is dead long ago."

The father looked at his face, in his eyes. There was great silence for a moment. Then the father said, "Certainly you are right. You have changed. You are a new man, you are completely transformed. I am on the point of death; is it possible for me also to have the same eyes you have, the same strength you have? Help me, an old man who is just going to the grave any moment." The father was also initiated into sannyas.

All the people who lived near Buddha knew his strength and at the same time they were all very protective of him. For an outsider it becomes very difficult to understand.

And this has been the case with me and with you. For the outsider it becomes very difficult -- almost impossible -- to understand why you are so protective of me. They cannot understand; it is not their fault. They have not known in their life a man who has a strength which transcends the strongest powers in the world -- and yet who is so vulnerable. Just a little poison, a bullet, a cross, and he is gone.

The higher values of life have to be protected. The lower values have a certain protection of themselves. A stone need not be protected, but just by the side of it the rose in the bush has to be protected. The stone is dead, it cannot be more dead. It does not need protection.

But the rose is so alive, so beautiful, so colorful, so attractive. That is the danger -- it is its strength, but it is inviting danger. Somebody may pluck it. Nobody will take up the stone, but the flower can be plucked.

So it is very natural -- don't feel any contradiction in it. And the people who see the contradiction, let them understand the situation. They have never come in contact in such a way with a person whom they love because of his strength; and yet because of his strength and his truth, they feel very protective because he is constantly in danger -- every moment the whole world wants to destroy him.

And it does not need you to take guns to protect me; just your desire to protect me is enough.

The U.S. marshal in America, in the first jail, told me, "You have been an experience for us, because the whole world seems to be protective of you! We have become enemies of the whole world. We are receiving threatening

phone calls: if anything happens to you, America's whole image will be damaged.

"For us there are only threatening calls, and for you they are sending flowers and telegrams and phone calls, and all the news media are surrounding every jail, wherever you are."

They had to change jails -- five jails in twelve days. It was absolutely unnecessary; every jail was the same. Why unnecessarily take me to five jails? They wanted to avoid the news media people -- people who had never known me but who had come to know me for the first time -- because America had illegally, undemocratically attacked an innocent man without any reason, without even an arrest warrant.

In those twelve days, not a single man I came across was against me. Even the criminals in the jails were very protective. Wherever I went they were protective. They said, "We have seen you, Bhagwan, on the television, but don't be worried about those dogs -- you are going to win because they are wrong."

And this U.S. marshal told me, "This is for the first time in my life... thousands of people from almost every country are watching what is happening to you."

Finally they decided to use a device: in the middle of the night they brought me to a jail so that nobody would know where I was. They told me that I should not write my name on their form, I should write "David Washington."

I said, "This is absolutely illegal. And you are forcing me to do something criminal. But what is the reason for it? -- just so that nobody knows that I am here in this jail; so that whatever you want to do to me.... You can do any harm,

you can even kill me. And there will be no trace where I disappeared because there is no entry for me -- in this jail I never entered -- and you can just fill out a bogus form that David Washington is released."

So I told them, "You write -- I cannot write with my own hand anything illegal. You fill in the form, I will simply sign it." He filled the form, and I signed my own name.

He looked at it and said, "What is this?"

I said, "It must be David Washington." And I told him, "You should remember that this is my name and it is known worldwide. Tomorrow morning you will have to face the press: `Where is David Washington?' Produce him and let him sign my signature, or produce the man who can make the signature."

Already, at five o'clock in the morning, they changed me again to another jail. I was only three or four hours in the previous jail because they understood that they had done a stupid thing; they would be caught at it. And I had told them, "Tomorrow morning it will be shown on every television."

Coming from the airport there was one young woman who was going to be released. I told her, "You just do me a little favor."

She said, "Bhagwan, I will do anything you want."

I said, "I don't want anything -- you simply sit in the corner, because they will process me first. You just listen to the whole talk and release it to the press who are waiting outside the door. The moment you are released, just tell all the television and radio and the newspapers whatever transpires in the talk between me and the marshal."

And that's what she did. With the six o'clock news it was all over America. And they were so ashamed; the whole of America was ashamed of this bureaucracy. And strangely, people who were not concerned with me, who had not even heard my name, were immensely protective -- everywhere. My feeling is that if you have something which authenticates you and makes you an embodiment of truth, people are going to be protective towards you.

And certainly those who are close, they are going to be very protective, too protective. In fact Vivek had made it so difficult -- I realized in these twelve days -- because she has been so protective about everything, I had completely forgotten how to do anything.

Even putting toothpaste on the brush I had not done for years... or changing the bed sheet, or carrying a towel to the bathroom. In twelve days I took only one shower -- and that too because Vivek was continually insisting in court when she met me, "Have you taken a shower?" That was her first question.

And I said, "I will take one, but it looks so strange to carry my own towel, my soap, that it is better for twelve days that I simply lie down with closed eyes." For twelve days I didn't change the sheet or the pillow cover. Even the nurses became protective!

They said, "Your blanket has to be changed; your clothes have to go for washing."

I said, "Forget all about it. It is only a question of a few days, then I can have as many baths, and as many new robes and new sheets... don't be worried." But they really became protective, seeing me, that I am almost like a child.

The head nurse started forcing me to go in the morning to brush my teeth!
She would say, "I will not give you your breakfast! If you want your breakfast, first you have to brush your teeth!"
And she would stand there!
And I said, "I will do it."
She said, "You are a strange man -- people are harassing us that, `we need this, we need that.' You are the only man who has no complaint, who has not asked for anything. On the contrary, we are worried that you don't do anything. You simply lie down with closed eyes!
"Perhaps the bathroom is not clean, so you can come to our bathroom; and we will not let anybody know because it is not allowed. No prisoner can come to the doctor's bathroom, but you take it for granted, that it is yours. You just use it -- but don't lock it from the inside. We will not allow anybody to enter."
I said, "Why?"
They said, "We don't trust you. You may lock it and if something happens to you, if you fall down or anything happens to you, how are we going to enter? And then the whole thing will be exposed, that we were allowing you in our bathroom -- which is against the rules."
And they were bringing fresh clothes every day. They were trying in every possible way. And the day I left, all the nurses -- there were five -- they were all crying.
I said, "This is strange! Why are you crying?"
They said, "We don't want you to go."
I said, "This is something! But my people are waiting there; otherwise I would have remained here."

They said, "We can understand. Just in these few days you have become so much part of this institution that we can understand how much your people, who have lived for years with you, must be feeling. But we will never forget these days." And they had all the pictures from the newspapers. Because they had no other way but from newspapers... they asked me to just sign my name.
I said, "You could have found a photographer."
They said, "It is not allowed -- even this is not allowed. Just sign silently so we can keep it as a memory."
You just have to be yourself, and you will find protection from every source. Because the more you are yourself, the danger to your life becomes more, but in the same proportion the protective forces, the loving forces, the friendly forces also increase. It is always balanced.

Light on the Path

Chapter #6

Chapter title: Follow your inner being, then no government is needed
1 January 1986 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
IS THERE ANY RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GNOSTICISM AND ANARCHY?

The word `anarchism' has tremendous implications.

It means that the people are so inwardly disciplined that they don't need any government. They are so deeply in order within themselves that no order outside is needed. Anarchism is basically the transformation of the individual in such a way that the government becomes superfluous. He lives in the light of his consciousness, fully aware of what he is doing, fully aware of its consequences, aware that it is not his right to interfere with any individual's life, or to trespass -- even in very subtle matters like conversion. Making an effort to convert somebody to your ideology is a trespass of that individual's consciousness. Unless he invites you, it is aggression.

So individuals have to be so conscious that no aggressive activity on any level -- bodily, mental, emotional -- is possible for them. Then the government is absolutely useless, a burden. And certainly the idea is that, if people can live without a government, then only are they people. If they need a government that means they are still coming out of animality. They have not yet become human. They need masters, governors, they are not capable of being on their own. They are basically asking to be slaves. The existence of a government of any kind means that the people are asking for slavery; and to ask for slavery and then to ask for democracy, freedom, freedom of expression, and individuality, becomes contradictory.

So the governments go on promising all these things but in the very existence of the government they are denied. Hence all governments are frauds. They can only promise but they cannot perform. It is existentially impossible. If they can perform then they are not needed. If they cannot perform that is why they are needed. So every government

is more or less symbolic of the fact that human beings have not grown up to their full height, to their full potential.
You are asking, "Are gnosticism and anarchy in some way related?" They are... because gnosticism means knowledge of your own. There are two kinds of knowledge. One is borrowed, either from books or from teachers, or from parents, or from the environment, the society in which you live. Unconsciously you go on absorbing so many things. This is not knowledge in the sense of gnosticism. This is a false substitute for true knowledge, and it is a hindrance. True knowledge is the discovery of truth, of love, of compassion, of all that is great in human life -- by yourself.
Every Buddhist scripture begins: "I have heard Gautam the Buddha say...." It is a hearsay, it is not knowledge. You may have heard Gautam the Buddha say something -- that does not mean that you have come to know it. It may become part of your memory, you may be able to repeat it like a parrot.... That's all that your priests, your pundits, are doing all over the world -- simply repeating exactly the way the parrot repeats, without knowing what he is saying. The pundits don't know what they are saying. They have heard, they have memorized; their memory is good, but their intelligence does not exist.
True knowledge means your own experience, your own search -- and when you know yourself there is no need to believe in anything. Every belief is poisonous because every belief will hinder you in searching for the truth.
Now the whole world believes in something or other. You ask anybody about God -- either he believes that God exists... and there are a few who believe that God does not exist; but both are beliefs. The communist believes that

God does not exist, but he has not explored, he has not gone into his own consciousness -- what to say about the whole existence? He has not explored his own small being. And there are millions who say, "We believe in the existence of God." But your belief cannot create a God -- if he does not exist your belief makes no difference. And if you believe in a God, naturally your seeking stops. Why should one seek and search when he believes? That's why all the religions emphasize faith, so that they can stop your search.

Faith is a block.

Search means you are still doubting, you are still not certain. Faith means you are absolutely certain that God exists. Now there is no question of enquiring. And if man goes on believing in such things which imply many absurdities....

For example. Galileo was told by the pope, "In your book you have to change the statement that the earth moves around the sun, because it goes against THE BIBLE". THE BIBLE says that the sun goes around the earth, and that's everybody's experience too. Certainly it appears so. In the morning it rises, in the evening it goes down -- it looks as if it is going around the earth.

Galileo was seventy-five years old -- he was almost dragged from his deathbed to the court to give an apology, because anything that is said in THE BIBLE cannot be disbelieved. It is the word of God; no enquiry is possible. Galileo said, "Such a small thing which has nothing to do with religion at all.... What does it matter whether the sun moves around the earth or the earth moves around the sun? It has no religious significance."

The pope said, "It is not a question of religious significance. The question is that if one thing is wrong in THE BIBLE, then the faith is shaken -- perhaps other things may be also wrong. If God has some stupid idea, then what is the guarantee that other things that are said are not of the same quality? So not a single word can be questioned."

Galileo must have been a man with a great sense of humor. He said, "To me it makes no difference. I will change it in the book, I will write that the sun moves around the earth, but my statement will not make any difference at all. The earth will go on moving around the sun, in spite of my statement. How can my statement make any difference to the earth?"

And that's what he did. He changed his statement and in a note, a footnote, he wrote: "It makes no difference to the earth or to the sun -- they go on their way. I am changing it because I don't want to be unnecessarily harassed in my old age."

And it has been so continuously since Galileo: everything that science comes to discover goes against THE BIBLE. Again and again the same problem arises. Because science has been progressing in the West, the struggle has been between science and Christianity.

But if we look, the same question is valid about every religion. Hinduism believes that the earth is flat, not round. But no Hindu makes a point of saying that the idea should be discarded, it goes against our researches. In the Hindu scriptures it says that the sun is smaller than the earth, which is absolutely nonsense -- the sun is sixty thousand times bigger than the earth. But no Hindu even bothers.

And most fundamentally, in the first place these things should not be in the religious scriptures, because religion has nothing to do with the size of the sun or the size of the earth. We should take out everything that is not religious from the religious scriptures.

Religious scriptures will need, every ten years, a new edition, because science will go on progressing, enquiring. And the way science enquires and progresses is exactly the way of man's inner search. He also doubts, questions, is skeptical, tries to find the truth himself. He becomes a lab unto himself.

Gautam Buddha could not find any God within himself. He searched to the very ultimate core of his being and he found no God. And if God is not existent in human consciousness, then God cannot be existent in the mountains, in the trees, which are far lower.

And the people who have come to the idea of God and have been preaching it, how have they found it? Where have they found it, and what is their method of finding it? Nothing is said about it in any scripture -- you simply have faith. But why should one have faith in anybody else, who may be lying, who may be disillusioned himself, who may be insane?

I cannot conceive that Moses encountered God, because God is not a person. So if anything happened, it must have been an illusion, it must have been a projection. And projections are very easy. Just go on a three-week fast, and your mind starts losing the capacity to ask questions. Your mind starts coming to a point where you cannot divide what is dream and what is real.

It is just as it happens to small children. They were dreaming of a beautiful toy and they wake up: the toy is not there and they are crying -- "Where is my toy?" And you cannot convince them, "You were dreaming, and this is reality. You have changed the whole dimension. That was your fiction, your idea, your mind and your imagination, and this is reality. It has nothing to do with your mind and your imagination."

All the religions have been teaching fasting. Nobody has bothered to ask why all the religions are agreed on fasting. My own understanding is that the reason is that after a certain time of fasting.... Your intelligence needs protein continuously to remain functioning. After three weeks the reservoir of protein in your brain is exhausted -- then you are again in the state of a child. You don't know what is dream and what is real.

It is those moments when people have realized Jesus Christ, Krishna, Gautam Buddha, Mahavira, or whatever has been always conditioned in their mind; it becomes projected. And they don't now have intelligence enough to feel the distinction between the real and the unreal.

The people like Moses or Jesus who have said that they have encountered God face to face must have been in such a state -- which can be experimentally created. And things are very clear: a Christian never comes to see Krishna; a Hindu never comes to see Christ because a Hindu mind is not being continuously conditioned to Christ -- he sees Krishna. The Buddhist never sees Krishna, the Jaina never sees Krishna.

You will be surprised that according to Jaina scriptures, Krishna is suffering in the seventh hell because he was the

cause of the greatest war this country has suffered, of the whole violence. And in fact there is some truth in it.
Arjuna was not willing to fight. He wanted to retire from fighting; he wanted to go to the Himalayas to meditate. He said, "It is better -- the others can keep the throne. Anyway they are my brothers. And what is the point of killing all these people?" -- because it was a family struggle and both parties were connected in many ways.
Arjuna's own master, who had made him the best archer in the world, was on the other side because he was also the master of his brothers.
Krishna was fighting on the side of Arjuna, and his own army was fighting on the other side because both parties had approached Krishna to join them.
He said, "Now this is difficult. I am alone -- how can I join two parties? You are both friends so you can choose: I will fight from one side and my army will fight from the other side."
It was a very strange war in which everybody was related. The grandfather of Arjuna, whom he loved and respected, was on the other side. The people with whom he was fighting were his cousin-brothers -- whom he had played and grown up with. Millions of people would be killed. And his argument was absolutely valid: "After killing all these people, sitting on the throne on all these corpses is absolutely meaningless. I will not be happy, I will be miserable my whole life. What will I gain? I won't even have people to celebrate with. Killing my own people with my own hands does not seem worthwhile. It gives me a clear idea that it is better to go to the mountains and to meditate and to forget all about this."

But Krishna persisted. When he could not continue to argue he brought in the last argument: "It is God's will. Now you cannot disbelieve in God's will, and it is God's will that you should fight."

Now this has been the strategy of all the priests all over the world -- "God's will." But I am surprised that a man of the intelligence of Arjuna did not ask, "If you know God's will, why is he not speaking directly to me? If it is God's will, you fight. But as far as I am concerned, I feel this is God's will -- that I drop out of this chariot and go to the mountains."

In his place, that's what I would have done. "Then that's perfectly good: if that is God's will for you... to me this is God's will. And if I have to choose I will choose my own rather than choosing yours."

But it has been used to simply destroy your arguments, your intelligence, and create fear. If you don't believe in God then there is hell. If you believe, then you have paradise and all the pleasures.

The Christian goes on seeing Christ, the Hindu goes on seeing Krishna, the Buddhist goes on seeing Buddha. And to see these people, simple psychological methods have been used: you should continuously pray. That makes you gullible.

A man waking up in the morning starts praying to Krishna the first thing -- or to Christ; goes to the church, listens to the priest, reads THE BIBLE or the GITA, which all preach, "Have faith." And it is repeated thousands of times his whole life.

There are people who become monks and move to a monastery -- they are the most prone to experience God

because twenty-four hours a day they have nothing else to do except go on repeating a certain mantra, a certain name. They become hypnotized with the name, with the figure. And all the religions teach that fasting purifies you. I don't understand how hunger can purify. If hunger purifies people then why should we try to destroy poverty? We are destroying pure people, spiritual people! We should make everybody hungry!

Hunger cannot purify. And look deeply into it: while you are hungry you think that you are not eating, but your body is absorbing your own flesh. That's why you go on losing weight; otherwise where does your weight go?

I have been condemned by Jainas because I said, at their conferences, "To fast is almost equal to meat-eating -- and you pretend to be nonviolent people, vegetarians. But fasting means non-vegetarianism -- you are eating yourself."

A very healthy man can live through a fast of three months; but after three months he will be just a skeleton, and then death is certain because now he has no more reserve to absorb. He cannot absorb bones.

But all these people have stopped their following from thinking. I said, "My challenge is, that it is a simple fact that you lose weight -- I simply ask where your weight disappears. You absorb it.

"Your body needs some energy every day. Working, walking, sitting -- whatever you are doing, your body needs energy, and food is simply fuel. If you are not giving it fuel, then the body starts eating itself -- it has a dual system just for emergency purposes. There may be a time when food is not available, you may be lost in a forest; the body

accumulates some flesh for such times." But you cannot raise such questions.

And secondly, if you fast you are depriving your intelligence.

There is a hierarchy -- just as in every household there is a certain division; that if you are hungry you won't purchase a television, you will purchase food which is a more basic necessity. But if you have enough food you are not going to go on purchasing food. You will start thinking of purchasing something else -- better furniture, a better house, a television, or radio or literature or music. You will start, but if suddenly your money is gone then the first things to go will be the higher things. The television will go first, the radio will go. You will retain your basic needs to the very last.

And that's how it happens when you fast. The first attack is on intelligence because that is the highest in you, and not a basic factor -- for life can exist without it; all the animals exist without it. So your intelligence starts disappearing.

If you remain hungry your love, which you have always thought such a great quality, will start disappearing. A hungry man cannot be loving. To a hungry man you cannot give beautiful literature to read, or beautiful music to listen to. That will simply be an ugly joke. He needs food.

So if you fast for three weeks -- I have fasted, and I talk only about things which I have tried -- after three weeks it becomes difficult to figure out whether you are dreaming or whether it is a reality. You just cannot make the distinction. The faculty that used to make the distinction is no longer there.

That is the reason that all the religions insist on fasting. They disagree on everything else, but they don't disagree on basic elements -- fasting, praying, continuous chanting, going to the church or the temple or the mosque, remaining absolutely faithful to the holy book -- it may be the KORAN, it may be the GITA, it may be THE BIBLE, it does not matter. But if you see, then the basic things are similar and their function is similar.

Gnosticism is a very revolutionary concept, and it never became a mass phenomenon. It always remained a very small stream of chosen people who had dropped all the nonsense the masses had been following, and who had tried on their own to reach into the inner core of their being. Faith does not change you, you remain the same, but a gnostic experience transforms you. And that is the only criterion to be used -- whether your knowledge is true or your knowledge is borrowed, whether it changes you or it simply becomes accumulated in your memory. You can become a good teacher, a good priest, a good leader, but you cannot become a good man.

It happened that just in the last part of the last century, Rani Rasmani built a temple in Calcutta, in Dakshineshwar on the bank of the Ganges. But Rani Rasmani was not a high-caste Hindu, she was a sudra, she was untouchable. So no brahmin was ready to worship in her temple, although she was immensely rich and she was ready to give as much money as you wanted. And she explained to the brahmins, "I have not even entered the temple; I simply go up to the steps and bow down from there. I have not entered the inner shrine; I have not even seen the statue of Krishna that is inside the temple. It is made with my money, but money

cannot be sudra because money is continuously changing hands from sudra to brahmin, from brahmin to chhatriya. So you cannot call the temple a sudra temple." But no brahmin was ready to be a priest in her temple -- all over Bengal she searched.

Ramakrishna agreed. He was uneducated. There are only two classes of Bengali, and he was very poor. The whole village tried to prevent him but they all knew he was a little eccentric: if he decides, then he decides.

They talked much about it, that it was built by a sudra. He said, "All the temples are made by sudras because the labor, the craftsmen -- they all belong to the sudra. Every temple is made by sudras. Can you show me a temple which is made by brahmins?" Not only are they made by sudras, but the most beautiful parts are made by Mohammedans because they have a traditional craftsmanship in marble. What they can do nobody else can do.

So Ramakrishna said, "All temples are made by sudras, there is no question about it. And money does not matter -- money goes on moving. And I cannot refuse her because it is a question of Krishna being there, unworshipped. You have made Krishna also a sudra, an untouchable. The rani herself cannot enter. I am going."

He went. The rani was happy but alerted because the man looked a little eccentric. But someone was better than no one, so she accepted Ramakrishna. And then complaints started coming about Ramakrishna.

The complaints were that sometimes he fights with Krishna. Rather than worshipping him, he shouts at him, fights with him. He uses vulgar language before him -- he

came from a village. Sometimes just to punish him he does not give Krishna food. And sometimes he dances the whole day from morning to evening, praying to Krishna.
The rani asked Ramakrishna, "What is going on?"
He said, "Everything is going well. When he is good to me I am good to him, and when he is nasty to me I am nasty to him. Sometimes I am praying for hours and he does not appear; then I punish him the next day: I don't give him food. That brings him to his senses. Certainly I also don't eat that day. I cry the whole day because I have not given food to him, I have not even opened the door -- I have let it remain locked."
One experience of Ramakrishna will show you how illusions can be created. In the beginning -- it was the birthday of Krishna -- he told him, "You have to appear today. It is no ordinary day, it is your birthday. I will dance and sing the whole day and the whole night. And if you don't appear" -- a sword used to hang there in the temple -- he said, "I will take the sword and cut off my head."
He danced the whole day; the evening came, the night came. It was in the middle of the night -- everything was silent. The temple is in a lonely place on the Ganges. Hungry the whole day, dancing the whole day, tired, utterly tired, he was continuously singing and praying, "Appear to me!" Then he pulled out the sword and was going to cut off his head when, at that moment, Krishna appeared. The sword fell from Ramakrishna's hand when he saw Krishna.
Now, it is so simple -- a psychological matter. If you do such things you lose the balance of your mind. And Ramakrishna was childish in his behavior, in his living. He

was praised as a saint because he was childlike, but because he was childlike he was experiencing Krishna face to face.
One of the great masters was passing through India.... There is a tradition of many masters: they go around the Ganges, all the way to the source, and then back along the other bank to where it falls into the ocean. One master was simply passing by and he came to know about Ramakrishna -- that he sees Krishna. He laughed. He said, "The man must be innocent but gullible. He must be innocent but childlike."
He remained in the temple; he talked to Ramakrishna. He explained to him what was happening: "What you are doing is all your creation. It is your imagination. Rama does not appear to you, Vishnu does not appear to you, Shiva does not appear to you. There is no question of Christ and Moses and others. Why does only Krishna appear to you? It is your imagination. And if you put so much pressure on your mind that you are going to cut off your head, naturally the mind is going to do anything to save your life."

Ramakrishna said, "Then you help me to get rid of this illusion."
The master said, "I can help, but the real thing has to be done by you. You sit silently, close your eyes, and when Krishna appears before your eyes, just cut him into two pieces and he will fall apart. There is nothing in it."
Ramakrishna asked, "From where do I bring a sword to cut him?"
And the master said, "From wherever you have brought this Krishna! If you can bring Krishna, from the same imagination you can bring a sword and cut him in two."

Ramakrishna tried three or four times, but the moment he saw Krishna he would start swaying and he would forget the sword and the cutting and the master and all his teaching.

The master said, "You are impossible! I am wasting my time. When you see Krishna appear in your mind you don't cut him; rather you start swaying. And I can see on your face that you are enjoying the experience."

Ramakrishna said, "I know that I am wasting your time, but what am I to do, because when he appears I simply forget myself."

So the master said, "I will bring a piece of glass, and when I see that you have started swaying and your face is looking ecstatic, I will cut exactly in the middle of your forehead with the glass to remind you that this is the time. You do the same: take the sword and cut Krishna in two."

He actually cut the forehead of Ramakrishna, and Ramakrishna gathered courage and cut Krishna inside. He remained for six hours in absolute silence, and when he opened his eyes, his first words were, "The last barrier has fallen... the last barrier has fallen."

Our own imagination is our last barrier. Once we are without imagination then reality is there face to face. It is not Christian, it is not Hindu, it is not Mohammedan. Gnosticism simply says this much: Each individual should follow his own inner being, dropping thoughts, imagination, emotions, sentiments -- anything that comes in the way. It is not you. The simple principle of gnosticism is that anything that you can see as an object is not you. You are the seer, so you cannot be the seen. "I can see the

furniture, then I am not the furniture. Whatever I can see, I am not it."

So go on dropping all that you can see inside yourself until you come to a space where you cannot see anything. Just the seer remains in its utter purity, innocence. And that is the moment of a great revolution -- perhaps the only revolution there is, because the seer cannot see anything, there is nothing to obstruct it.

That is the meaning of the word "object." Object means "that which obstructs you." There is no object there -- all is empty. It can go as far as... but there is nothing. Then it turns upon itself, then it becomes its own object.

When the subject itself becomes its own object -- in other words when the observer is the observed too, when the knower is the known too -- you have arrived home. And that is the meaning of gnosticism.

There is a certain relationship between anarchism and gnosticism because both depend on the individual. And anarchism will be impossible without gnosticism, because only gnosticism can transform people and can bring such quality and energy in them that they don't need any government at all.

A man of awareness does not need anybody else to tell him what to do, what not to do. He does not need the moral teacher, the priest, the policeman, the judge. They all become meaningless.

And it will become one of the greatest days in the history of man when government becomes useless and is to be dropped. That means man has transcended all animality in him -- violence, anger, hatred -- all that needs a government to control people; otherwise there will be so many rapes,

and there will be so many murders. There will be so many thefts, and nobody will be safe.
The government is simply an agreement of the society. "We are not capable of controlling ourselves -- we need a central control, powerful enough so that individuals cannot dare... or if they dare to do something, then they can be punished." Even with the government crime goes on growing, the jails go on growing, the judges go on growing, the criminals go on growing, the laws go on growing.
So if you simply remove the government, there will be chaos, and all that is repressed in man out of fear... because both government and religion, the two powerful institutions, use fear and greed to repress your animal. They don't change it. If you are caught the government will send you to jail to be punished. If you are not caught, then the religions will send you to hell to suffer.
It is a basic agreement that if your action is found out, it becomes a crime; if it is not found out, it remains a sin. But on both bases the fear is there that you will have to suffer.
And on the other hand, if you remain good the government has rewards. You become padam shree, you become bharat bhushan, you have a Nobel Prize, and so many awards around the world for people who have proved... who have repressed everything that can be objectionable -- they are rewarded. And if they are not rewarded here, they will be rewarded in paradise with all the pleasures of the world.
But this is only a strategy to keep man's animality somehow repressed. It does not bring any change. Gnosticism means a change in your very being.
Then you don't need any fear; you don't need any hell, and you don't need any awards. You don't need any heaven,

because to transcend your animality is the greatest reward possible. It is so blissful and so ecstatic to become really human that there is no need for anything else to be added to it. So gnosticism has no God, has no heaven, no hell -- those are religious types of government.

So I can see a relationship between anarchism and gnosticism. But gnosticism is more fundamental, has to happen first; only then can anarchism have a chance. Up to now it has remained a utopia.

To single individuals it has happened, but it has to happen to the whole of humanity. And when it happens to single individuals, it is very strange: the governments are not happy. And now you can understand why they are not happy.

The very happening of the transformation of the human being so that he has no animality in him, creates a fear in government and in the religious hierarchy because that man shows that it can happen to all. And the moment it happens to all, governments and religions both will be useless, discarded. And nobody who has so much power would like to be discarded. No government wants to be discarded, no religion wants to be discarded.

So a very strange thing -- they go on teaching people to be good, but deep down they want you to remain the same because their whole existence is dependent on your being they way you are.

I have been talking to politicians, to religious leaders, and I have pointed it out: "Are you really interested in man becoming absolutely good? Then the saint will not be a saint, because everybody will be so good. What is the point of somebody being a saint?

"We remember Gautam Buddha as a great saint because the whole society was not good. So he stands out. But if the whole society was good he would be lost in the crowd -- there would be no need to remember him. Why do we go on remembering only a few names in the whole of history? For the simple reason that they stood out.

"Everybody has the capacity to stand in the same position as Gautam Buddha. The governments, the politicians, want people the way they are. They may talk about change, but nobody wants any change because change in the people means change in the vested interests.

"Now, if nobody commits a crime what will happen to all your courts? What will happen to all your jails and your police and all your law-enforcement agencies? They will simply be out of employment.

"And if people are good and nobody wants to fight, nobody wants to kill anybody -- if people refuse, and say, `Why should we kill any Pakistani or any Chinese?'... Or a Pakistani refuses to kill, and says, `Why should we kill a Hindustani? There is no reason, because this man has done nothing to me. He has children and he has a wife and he may have an old mother, a father to look after. I am not going to kill him. There is no reason for me to kill.'

"What will happen to your governments, your armies?" They are all against me because I have been saying things like this which can cut them from their very roots. They have no arguments against me -- then the only way is to create any lies, any allegations and anything they want to say about me. But nobody answers the question.

So it is a very strange state. The government exists to keep people good -- but that is not true. It exists to keep people as they are, not to allow them to go through a revolution. A better kind of people will need a better kind of government, a better kind of religion. And if people are really perfect they don't need any government, they don't need any religion. They are their own government and they are their own religion.

So the perfect man is continuously being killed.

You killed Socrates because he was a perfect man. That was his only crime. He has not done anything wrong in his whole life, and he asked the court, "Why are you going to kill me? What crime have I committed except that I have not committed any crime?"

But he was dangerous. A simple man, a very perfect man, is looked on as dangerous by the society, by the religious people, by the government, by all the authorities, because he creates a situation in which every man can think, "If it can happen to Socrates, why can't it happen to me?" He can become an example. He can trigger a certain consciousness in the whole of humanity.

He has to be destroyed before he becomes a wildfire and people start being just like him.

Socrates was blamed by the court; they said, "You have been corrupting human beings" -- a strange allegation. "Corrupting human beings, particularly the youth." To teach the youth to become perfect human beings is seen by the authorities to be corrupting them, because it means death to the authorities; whether they are religious or secular, it does not matter.

So on the one hand these people go on trying to make a show that they are trying to create a better society. On the other hand they go on killing the examples of perfection.

Light on the Path

Chapter #7

Chapter title: Awareness is magic
1 January 1986 pm in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
EVERYTHING IN LIFE IS SO EXTRAORDINARY, SO BEAUTIFUL -- SNOW CRYSTALS, A BIRD, THE MOVEMENT OF MY OWN HAND. WHY THEN DO I LOSE MYSELF IN IDIOTIC THINGS?

One of the most difficult things, but one of the most fundamental things in life, is not to divide life into beautiful and idiotic things -- not to divide life at all. They are all part of one whole.
It needs just a little sense of humor. And to me the sense of humor is very essential for a person to be whole.
What is wrong in some small idiotic things? Why can't you laugh and enjoy them? All the time you are judging what is right, what is wrong. All the time you are sitting in the seat of a judge, and that makes you serious. Then flowers are beautiful, but what about the thorns?
They are part of the existence of flowers. The flowers will not exist without the thorns. The thorns are protective; they

have a function, a purpose, a meaning. But you divide: then flowers are beautiful and thorns become ugly. But in the tree itself it is the same juice that goes into the flower and into the thorn. In the existence of the tree there is no division, no judgment.

The flower is not favored, the thorn is not tolerated. They are both accepted totally.

And this should be our approach in our own life.

There are things, small things, which if you judge, look stupid, idiotic. But it is because of your judgment; otherwise they also fulfill something essential.

For example, many people have asked me, "Why do we go on smoking cigarettes, cigars, when we know perfectly well that they are dangerous to our health, that they will reduce our life span, that we will suffer. The doctors are telling us... but we are so idiotic that we go on smoking."

And I have asked those people, "Have you observed your doctors?"

They said, "That too is true -- they all go on smoking!"

Nobody looks into small things very deeply without any judgment. If you observe... that is not judgment; you are simply a witness while smoking -- if you observe, you can see a few things: What are the situations when you smoke? What are the situations when the urge comes to you? And you will be surprised that those are the situations when you are tense, worried, nervous... you don't have anything to do. And we have been brought up by the society to believe that the empty mind is the devil's workshop.

Something has to be done -- you are not to be empty. You have to fill yourself. A cigarette comes in handy: it gives you something to do, and something really significant --

because it relaxes you. It has nicotine in it which helps you to become non-tense. It helps you for the moment to forget your worries.

For the moment, the cigarette gives to a simple, ordinary person a little space you can only call contemplative. He knows it harms, so later on he judges, then condemns it, condemns himself: "I am stupid, doing something that is not good for me."

But he never observes the whole process. If he observes the whole process then he should not condemn it; rather he should learn how to relax, how not to be nervous, how not to be tense. And he will find fewer and fewer opportunities for smoking. And when these superficial opportunities are dissolved, he will come to the rock bottom of the fact: smoking is some kind of substitute. It is the mother's breast. Every child has been taken away from the mother before he wanted to be taken away. For example, in aboriginal tribes, smoking is not a problem because children go on using the mother's breast for feeding themselves as long as they want. It is only up to them to decide when they want to change and go to solid food.

But in civilized societies... the more civilized a society, the more there will be smoking -- for the simple reason that every child is taken away from the breast too early. The reason is clear: if the child goes on feeding from the mother's breast, the breast loses its shape, the woman loses some beauty; she starts looking older before she is old. The very modern women simply never feed the child from the breast. Now, the breast is not only just giving milk -- because milk can be given by a bottle. It is also giving warmth, love, concern for the child.

Humanity has forgotten a few very basic things; for example, touching and its tremendous importance in your life.

If the mother has not taken you close to her body, to her warmth, you will remain cold your whole life; you will not be able to give love and warmth to any woman, because you never received any. You don't know that anything like that even exists. The breast keeps you close to the mother's warmth, makes you feel one with the mother's body.

In nature, the break between the mother and the child does not come drastically-the child is not taken away from the mother when it is born. No, the break comes very slowly and very naturally; it comes only in its own time. When the child is mature enough he will not be interested in smoking. Smoking is very similar to breast-feeding. The cigarette represents the nipple of the mother, and the warm smoke represents the warm milk flowing through the mother's breast. So you may be even fifty, or sixty, or seventy, but somewhere, in some corner of your being, you have remained retarded. The day you were taken away from the mother's breast... something in you is still ungrown and wants to be fulfilled.

To many sannyasins I have suggested that whenever you feel like smoking, just try a bottle of milk, warm milk. They laughed at the idea. I said, "You can laugh at the idea, but just try and enjoy it."

They said, "But what will people say? In the office we cannot use a small child's bottle."

I said, "You can start trying it at night, in your bed. But give it a try and see how it changes your smoking pattern."

And they were surprised, they loved it! And their smoking was reduced; slowly, slowly it disappeared. A certain need -- -but you judge it as idiotic. It looks idiotic on the surface, but nothing is idiotic. Somewhere there must be some existential reason for it.

So don't judge anything; rather, change your approach from judgment to observation. Howsoever stupid a thing it may be, just observe it without any prejudice. Not with the idea that it is stupid -- then you cannot observe. Without any judgment and without any prejudice, simply observe it. Go deeper into it, find reasons why it is there. You will find one day the rock bottom, and the whole thing will disappear.

Awareness is magic. It can make things disappear -- you just have to be very persistent in not judging but just being aware. Go deeper and deeper into it, whatever it brings, and then things will be clear to you, what has to be done.

The doctor is not telling you how you can drop your smoking, he simply goes on telling you to drop smoking, otherwise you will suffer. You know it, everybody is saying it -- in the magazines, in the papers, on the radio, everywhere you are hearing it. Now even governments have passed resolutions around the world that on every cigarette packet there should be a warning that it is dangerous to health.

In the beginning, the manufacturers of cigarettes around the world were naturally against it. This is a strange thing, that you are selling something, and rather than advertising it, you are putting a label on it saying that it is dangerous to your health. But you will be surprised: it has not affected the sales of cigarettes at all. People read it, but it is not

new; they have heard it so many times before. It is the same old stuff.

Take any small thing that you go on doing, approach it with awareness to its very roots, and it starts disappearing. The basic thing is learning not to judge, because the moment you judge, your observation is clouded. Then you can never see clearly; you have already concluded. You have not been scientific, you have been already carrying a belief.

In my childhood I asked my father -- that was my way -- "You have to give me money because now I am going to smoke."

He said, "This is strange. No boy of your age can have the courage to ask his own father for money, and that too for smoking."

I said, "It is up to you; otherwise I will steal, and it will be your money. You will be forcing me to commit two crimes -- smoking and stealing. And then I will have to commit a third crime, lying, because whenever you ask, I will say, `No, I don't smoke.'

"I am making things simple. Just give me the money. I want to smoke just to see why people are smoking and what they find in it, because I see people all around smoking against the warning of teachers, parents, doctors, priests -- everybody. There must be something if they don't listen to anybody and still go on.

"And they are paying for it, for their sickness, for their death to come earlier, to have tuberculosis, or cancer of the lungs. I cannot make any judgment before I experiment. Now it is up to you. You want me to do three wrong things or just one?"

He looked at me and said, "You are just impossible! Now I cannot even prevent you from smoking. You are asking money from me... but you are right, you would have to do three wrong things, so take the money."
And I said, "I am going to smoke in the house, not hiding somewhere behind the house. I am going to smoke in my own house."
He said, "Don't do that! Because my father is still alive; your uncles are there, your aunts are there" -- it was a joint family of fifty people. "They will all condemn me -- they won't say anything to you -- they will say that you gave him money for smoking and he is smoking just sitting in the middle of the house so everybody can see!'"
I said, "It is better that everybody sees it; otherwise they will hear it from somebody and they will have to ask me. Why waste time unnecessarily?"
I smoked sitting in the middle of the house. Everybody was angry with my father, that this was going too far. But the first cigarette was enough; it was my last cigarette because tears came to my eyes and I started coughing. I said, "It is all nonsense. Even if somebody pays me to smoke, I am not going to smoke." The remaining packet I returned to one of my uncles who was always smoking, hiding.
He tried to say, "I don't want...."
I said, "Why be afraid? You have seen me smoking in the middle of the house -- why do you hide here and there? I know, everybody knows that you smoke. Keep these cigarettes; otherwise I will have to throw them out. They are costly because I had told my father that these may be my first and last, so I want the best ones."

When anything that you are doing makes you feel that something is wrong, don't be too hasty to call it wrong; there must be a long chain of causes. You have to watch the whole thing. And until you reach to the basic root, it is going to remain.

And this is what I call the magic of awareness: the moment you reach the basic root of anything it disappears, it simply disappears. You don't have to drop it, you don't have to take a vow, "I will not smoke again." It simply drops of its own accord because you have become aware of the whole process. Now you will rather try to learn something that makes you relaxed, helps you not to be nervous.

I have seen people strangely... I used to know one of the speakers of the state assembly. He must have been seventy, and he must have been speaking for fifty years at least. He was the speaker of the assembly, but each time he stood to speak, he was so nervous that he used to keep his hands in his pockets. Those hands were just trembling.

He was also the vice-chancellor of my university, where I was teaching. One day he was inaugurating a new library building, and as he started speaking with his hands in his pockets, I approached with a piece of paper with some note on it. He had to take his hands out, he had to take the paper, and the paper went like this... and the whole audience was laughing. And there was nothing on it, just unreadable scribble.

He was very angry. He called me after the meeting into his office, and he said, "What was the need to expose me?"

I said, "It was absolutely necessary. You are seventy, you are a public speaker -- forty years or more you have been speaking -- and your hands tremble. Do you think nobody

knows? Your hands are trembling in your pockets also. Anybody who has a keen observation can see that they are inside and trembling. I simply wanted you to be aware that hiding won't help. Why are you so nervous?

"You are not an amateur. A new person facing an audience may feel afraid perhaps, may wonder perhaps whether he proves up to the standard of the people and their expectations or not. But you are a well-know speaker. You have proved yourself; now there is no need to be afraid. But you have been hiding your fear for these fifty years -- not from other people but from your own consciousness, from your own awareness. What is the problem?

"Next time you try it: let your hands tremble but let them come out, they should not be in your pocket; otherwise I am going to come with a piece of paper again, and you will have to receive the paper, either with your mouth or with your hands.

"If you receive it with your mouth, you cannot speak; if you receive it with your hands the whole audience will see. It is better, if I am present that your hands are out of your pockets. But I would like you to go deeper into this stupid habit."

He became silent. He had been angry, but now he was not angry because I had not done any wrong to him; I had brought something to his notice which he had been denying to himself and to the whole world. Now he was seventy and soon he would be dying.

I said, "You think about it. I am available to help you -- I can come anytime you want -- but first you go through it from the very beginning, how it started and why you have not been able to change it your whole life. And it doesn't

look right for a well-known speaker, the speaker of the assembly."

I said, "I will be coming tomorrow. You just look into it. Rather than avoiding it, face it! Don't condemn it. It is condemnation which has caused the whole problem."

And the next day when I reached him, he said, "You are right. It was my father: because when, for the first time, in my high school days, I went to speak in a competition between two schools, I was preparing my speech, and my father was a man who wanted everything to be perfect -- a real perfectionist."

Perfectionists are always neurotic, because in life nothing can be perfect, and they are always miserable because life is never as they want it. So he told the boy, "You repeat your speech again and again. Go to the bathroom, stand before the mirror, repeat your speech, and see that no nervousness is there."

The vice-chancellor said to me, "Even in my bathroom, although there was nobody, I could feel great nervousness coming to me, and particularly to my hands. I tried again and again, but the more I tried, the more my hands were trembling. I went to my father and told him -- he was a very prominent military officer. He said, "If your hands tremble, keep them in your pockets. Nobody should know about them; otherwise you will become a laughingstock."

I said, "If I had been your father I would have told you to use your hands and their energy as gestures, because there are things which cannot be said by words but can be indicated by the hands. In fact, to keep your hands in your pockets cuts off almost half of your communication, because words are not complete; they need much support

from your hands, your eyes, your voice, your tone. Even the silences between your words are expressive.

"So rather than using the energy of the hands in gestures, you have been repressing it -- and energy cannot be repressed. Your father had no idea that your hands are joined with your mind. Hands are extensions of the mind: your left hand is the extension of the right side of your mind; your right hand is the extension of the left side of your mind.

"If the mind is functioning perfectly, then your hands are certainly going to move with the movement of the mind. Stopping the hands, you are cutting off your own possibility of expressing more clearly, more penetratingly, more emphatically. You will remain a poor speaker. And you may be hurt," I told him, "that although you are the speaker of the assembly and a well-known speaker, I want you to know that you are a poor speaker.

"Your speech has no juice in it, no gusto in it, no emphasis in it. It is flat, as if you are reading -- there are no gaps. You are not communicating with people, you are really avoiding the people. You are saying things but there is no joy in saying it, there is no music in it. Release your hands."

It happened in America in the first jail where I was -- the sheriff of the jail immediately fell in love with me. He was a really nice and beautiful old man. And when the court denied bail to me he said to me, "This is absolutely unjust -- to keep somebody in jail whose crime is not proved; whose crime is not even tried: there has been no trial. And to refuse bail -- it is just political, unjust."

I asked him, "Would you help me a little?"

He said, "I will help you all the way. What do you want me to do?"
I said, "I would like a press conference in the jail."
He said, "It has never happened in history -- a press conference in jail by a prisoner."
I said, "Then let it happen, let it be a precedent! And if you feel it was unjust, then do something." He agreed. The press conference was called, but my hands were cuffed, and I told him, "It will be impossible for me to speak with my hands in chains." And not only were they in chains; they put a chain belt around my waist, and they locked the handcuffs to the belt, so you could not move more than this....
So I said, "I will not be able to speak at all. You have done a great favor to call the press conference" -- and almost one hundred press people were there, all the television and radio stations and all the big newspapers. "Now, do me a favor -- because I am not going to escape. I have chains on my legs; you can keep the chain on my waist. You can put chains all over my body, but leave my hands free. It is impossible for me to speak a single word without my hands being in harmony with what I am speaking."
He understood. He said, "I have seen you on the television, and I have loved your hands and I have loved it that they certainly express something."
I told that vice-chancellor, "You give freedom to your hands -- that will give freedom to your mind. Your speech will become alive. There is no harm in the fact that you are now seventy years old; it is never too late to begin. And you will be immensely joyous for the first time because all your speeches... and you have to speak almost every day,

and it is a torture to you. If you are nervous, speaking is a torture to you, it is not a joy."
He agreed with me. The first day he spoke with his hands out of his pocket, the whole university wondered what had happened because nobody had seen him like this. And there was no trembling, the trembling became gestures.
He called me again -- there were tears in his eyes -- and he said, "Fifty years of speaking have been hell to me. You released me from that hell. Nobody ever told me that I am the cause of the whole nervousness, that I am repressing an energy that can be transformed."
Most of the things that you think are stupid, idiotic... if looked at deeply, it may turn out that you have just not used the energy rightly. Simple observation, and you will be able to change.
I never tell anybody to change anything by force, because anything changed by force is never changed. And the more you use force to change things, the more you are imprisoned by your own force.
My approach is absolutely nonviolent.
Just watch, and watch to the very root cause. And you will be surprised that what was looking like stupidity has changed into something intelligent, something beautiful.
The whole life can be an organic whole of beauty.
You can ask your second question.

Question 2
BELOVED OSHO,
DO YOU AGREE WITH THE CHOICE SOCRATES MADE? WOULD IT HAVE BEEN YOUR CHOICE?

It is very difficult to answer for the simple reason that I am not the same type of person as Socrates. If the choice was given to me, I certainly would not have chosen death by poisoning, because to me it is simply suicidal, against life. And my whole approach is life-affirmative.

I would not have chosen to die, but somewhere deep down there must be a suicidal instinct in Socrates himself. The choice is coming from him. I am not a lover of martyrs -- I think they are insane.

I would have chosen just to be outside Athens, just close to the boundary of Athens, where my people could reach. I don't think... what was the problem? The judges were saying, "Just get out of Athens." Socrates is more insistent on his own egoistic stand of "Either I will have all or I will not have anything -- all or none."

I don't see life in those terms. You never have all, you cannot have all. There is no need to make such a division between all or none. Have as much as you can, squeeze every moment to its totality -- but what is the hurry to die? Athens was a city state -- he could have moved just out of the boundary of the city, and his people would have been perfectly willing to come there. In fact it would have been far easier there, outside the city, to have a beautiful school where he could teach silently only to those who really wanted, than to have a school in the main part of the city with all the hustle and bustle.

And the question is not of Socrates, the question is of the truth. Socrates sacrificed not only himself, he also sacrificed his truth. He also sacrificed the people who loved him, the people who wanted to listen to him, the people who wanted him to live.

That would have been my choice. And in fact that has been my choice in America. They had no crime against me. They knew it -- the judge knew it, everybody was aware that they had no crime against me. And all the crimes that they are talking about -- there were mainly two. One was that I helped people to get married, and those marriages were just to get residence in America.

It was absolutely false because for three and a half years I had been silent and I had not been meeting with any sannyasin. It was true that people had married just to remain in America, but it was not my arrangement; I was not guilty of it. I had not told anybody, not a single person, to get married to somebody. I was not seeing people at all; I was in isolation and in silence.

And the whole house -- twenty people who were taking care of me -- they were witnesses that nobody entered in the house and I didn't go anywhere. So it was absolutely absurd.

Their second charge was that before coming to America I had an intention to remain there forever. I told my attorneys, "This is absolutely absurd, because unless they can read somebody's mind, I don't think the judge or the U.S. attorney or anybody.... I am standing here in the court: can they say what I am going to do next? Then I will hit the U.S. attorney.

"If he cannot see my intention right in front of him, on what grounds can he say that I had that intention? You can talk about actions because actions can have witnesses; but intentions don't have witnesses. Intentions cannot be punished.

"You may intend to kill the whole of humanity. That does not mean that you should be crucified. You did not kill a single ant -- you just intended to. You can enjoy intending to kill the whole humanity, to create a third world war, but it cannot be a crime.

"On these two grounds you have arrested me without any arrest warrant -- which is illegal. You have not even shown me what the cause of my arrest is, which I am absolutely entitled to know. You did not allow me to call my attorney, which is my birthright. You have been committing all kinds of sins and crimes against me."

They knew that in a trial they were going to lose the case. They had made the case "The United States versus Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh." If they lost the case it would be really very damaging to the prestige of the nation -- that a single individual wins against the whole nation. And it is their folly that they have named the case in this way -- I have not named it.

At the last moment they understood that they were in trouble, that they were going to lose. They asked for negotiation with my attorneys, and the negotiation was exactly the same as the situation was in the case of Socrates. The negotiation was -- they said it clearly -- "We don't have any factual grounds to prove anything, so we are ready to negotiate before the trial begins.

"Only one thing is needed: Bhagwan should accept in court that he is guilty. Then we will withdraw the case, and he will not be allowed to enter America for five years. If he insists, that "I am not guilty,' then we are not going to allow bail for him at any cost -- five million dollars, ten million

dollars. No, no amount of money. The United States government is not ready to give him bail.
And we will prolong the case as much as we can -- five years, seven years, ten years. So in those ten years he will be harassed, in those ten years his work will suffer, in those ten years his commune will suffer, in those ten years millions of his people around the world will suffer. Of course he will win in the end. But these ten years will be a nightmare for millions of people, so the choice is yours."
Certainly Socrates would not have said, "I am guilty." Even my attorneys were afraid to tell me what the government wanted. There were tears in their eyes when they said, "We have come to ask you something which is absolutely absurd, but the question is, if you insist that you are not guilty -- which we know you are not, and which we proved that you are not, but it is out of our hands.... The bail, the pressure of the government is too much. They are not ready to give bail to you, and they may prolong the case for five, seven years. That will destroy your whole work; your people will suffer."
In just twelve days hundreds of people around the world were not eating, were fasting, crying, weeping, feeling absolutely helpless, "What to do?"
"So they want you simply to say, `I am guilty.'"
I said, "Don't be worried and don't cry. I am a totally different man than Socrates. To me compassion and love are far higher qualities than my own ego. I don't have any. I will say to the court that I am guilty, and then my whole life I will prove to the whole world that I was not guilty, and I was forced by the government, under oath, to lie.

"On one hand you put me under oath: 'You will speak only truth and nothing else but truth,' and on the other hand you make a situation in which I have to lie."
And I told my people, "Don't be worried, I will say I am guilty. My saying it does not make me guilty. And once I am out, there is my whole life to prove that I was not guilty and the American government is guilty. The whole thing is criminal: to put me under oath and then to force me to lie or be ready to suffer in jails for any period of time; and to let my whole movement be destroyed.
I love my people. For them I can speak not one but one thousand lies. I love my work, so this is nothing; you don't be worried.
Certainly my choice would have been different. Just outside Athens would have been my commune!

Light on the Path

Chapter #8

Chapter title: Don't search for a home, search for yourself
7 January 1986 pm in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
IN THESE TIMES OF UNCERTAINTY, THE BEST -- AND THE WORST -- SEEMS TO BE COMING OUT IN THOSE OF US WHO ARE AROUND YOU. WOULD YOU COMMENT ON THIS?

There are no "times of uncertainty" because time is always uncertain. It is the difficulty with the mind: mind wants certainty -- and time is always uncertain.

So when just by coincidence mind finds a small space of certainty, it feels settled: a kind of illusory permanence surrounds it. It tends to forget the real nature of existence and life, it starts living in a kind of dream world; it starts mistaking appearance for reality. It feels good to the mind because mind is always afraid of change for the simple reason: who knows what change will bring -- good or bad? One thing is certain, that change will unsettle your world of illusions, expectations, dreams.

Mind is just like a child playing on the seashore, making palaces in the sand. For a moment it seems that the palace is ready -- but it is made of shifting sands. Any moment just a small breeze, and it will be shattered to pieces. But we start living in that dream palace. We start feeling that we have found something which is going to remain with us always.

But time continuously goes on disturbing the mind. It looks hard but it is really very compassionate of existence to always remain with you. It does not allow you to make realities out of appearances. It does not give you a chance to accept masks as your real face, your original face.

So whenever time strikes one of your cherished illusions, it feels that it brings out the worst and the best in peoples' lives. It simply brings out what was hidden behind the false permanence, behind a dream that you had taken for granted to be real. It simply takes away your mask. It has nothing to do with good or bad, better or worse -- it simply takes away your mask. It simply exposes you, it brings you to face

yourself, so whatever you have been repressing starts surfacing. It can be the worst, it can be the best.

Time has nothing to do with these categories. It simply allows your repressed to surface, it brings you to yourself. Most of the people are hiding the worst. It is very rare to find a person who is hiding the best -- why should he hide the best? People are even pretending to show themselves in the best of colors -- why should they hide the best? People simply hide the worst, thinking that it is ugly.

A change -- and your mask slips. A change -- and you are for a moment... suddenly you find yourself naked. You have lost your clothes and the whole reality becomes a mirror: from everywhere your nudity, your nakedness is reflected.

Yes, very rarely, very exceptionally it also happens that the best comes out. But the best comes out only in those people who don't have a mask, who are already naked, and who have already accepted their nudity as beautiful and natural. So the change in time cannot destroy anything in them; on the contrary, it enhances. It brings to light something which they may have forgotten, others may have forgotten. We tend to take things for granted.

So, only in a few exceptional cases where a person has been living innocently, without any hypocrisy, where a person is living knowing perfectly that nothing is certain here, and nothing is permanent.... And to expect these things is to create grounds for your own frustrations in the future -- it is sowing seeds of despair, of anguish, of anxiety.

If you accept that change is the nature of reality, and everything is going to change; if you know it moment to

moment, that the next moment may bring something totally new and whatever is so real in this moment will disperse like a cloud -- which was here a moment ago and now is no longer here.... If this awareness is there, then any change does not create difficulty, then every change is acceptable. You do not resist it, you do not want it to be otherwise. Even if it takes you and your beautiful dreams, your cherished desires, your half-finished palaces, there is no frustration because it was accepted from the very beginning that this can happen at any moment. So there is no conflict, there is no frustration in reality. You are at ease.

Hence I say there are no times of difficulties, no times of uncertainties. Time is change, is always changing. It is just that we go on making permanent things. Against time, we are going to be defeated -- and we are at fault. And when we are defeated, naturally we are angry, we are frustrated with existence itself. We lose our trust. It seems that everything is against us, and we start living in paranoia, in fear -- a certain spiritual trembling enters into our being. But this happens because we have been expecting something which is not part of reality. Existence has no obligation to fulfill our expectations. And then mostly the worst comes out, because that is what we had hidden behind a certain idea of permanency. We were living with the idea that this was going to last forever; now there is no need to change. And then suddenly the whole earth disappears from under our feet -- and naturally the worst comes out in people.

The best is also possible, but it is possible only if you have been living in tune with life, existence, without asking any

favors. And we are always asking favors. If we are not asking any favors then there is no frustration, no anger. For example, many who have been with me have felt great frustration with life itself because they worked hard, they put their whole energy into creating a beautiful dream, and as they were almost getting it finished -- just the finishing touches were to be done -- suddenly the whole thing disappears. They will feel angry, disgusted, against the whole of existence -- but it is simply our own doing.

I am not frustrated -- I have not even looked back for a single moment. Those were beautiful years, we lived beautifully, and it is the nature of existence: things change. What can we do? So we are trying to make something else -- that will also change. Nothing is permanent here. Except change, everything changes.

So I don't have any complaint. I have not felt even for a single moment that something has gone wrong... because here everything has gone wrong, but to me nothing has gone wrong. It is just that we tried to make beautiful palaces out of playing cards. You were just finishing and a breeze comes in without knowing that you were making palaces out of playing cards, and those palaces are scattered all around.

Perhaps except for me everybody is frustrated. And they feel angry at me too because I am not frustrated, I am not with them. That makes them even more angry. If I was also angry, and I was also complaining, and I was also tremendously disturbed, they would have felt a consolation. But I am not.

We enjoyed whatever we were doing, and we will be enjoying whatever we will be doing -- and things will go on

changing always. If this remembrance is always there as a lighthouse, then it will never make you feel in such a state that a difficult time, an uncertain time has brought the worst. We had never planted the seeds for it in the first place.

That's why I am amongst you, but still something of me remains a stranger, an outsider. For the simple reason that I look at things in a totally different way; to me it is all acceptable.

Now it is going to be difficult to make another dream come true because many of those who worked to make one dream come true will be in a state of defeatism. They are defeated. They will feel that reality or existence does not care about innocent people who were not doing any harm, who were simply trying to make something beautiful. Even with them existence goes on following the same rule -- it makes no exceptions.

So many sannyasins will be in a state of defeatism, will find it very difficult to make another effort again. They will feel, "What is the point? We will put in our energy, our expectations, our hopes, and who knows? -- tomorrow everything is destroyed just by any small thing." They will feel it is better not to hope, it is better not to dream. It is better to get lost in ordinary life where people don't dream, where people don't hope, where people don't create, where people go on living a day-to-day life.

In that life you don't come across such frustrations. Such frustrations come only when you try to reach the moon. And when you have almost reached, suddenly the moon disappears and you are further away from it than you have

ever been: further away than before you had started the journey.

I can see that it is painful, but we are responsible for the pain. It feels that life is not just, not fair, because it has taken a toy from our hands. One should not be in such a hurry to come to such great conclusions. Wait a little more. Perhaps it is always for the good -- all the changes. You should just be patient enough. You should give life a little more rope.

And always remember, the joy is not in completing something; the joy is that you desired, that you desired it with your total intensity, that while you were making it you had forgotten everything, the whole world -- that it was the only focus of your whole being. And there is your bliss and your reward -- not in the completion, not in the permanence of anything.

In this changing flux of existence we have to find in each moment its own reward. Whatever we were doing, we did our best, we were not half-hearted; we were not keeping back something: we were putting our total being into the act. That's where our bliss is.

Then what happens to those dreams... they are really dreams, and it is a great challenge to make dreams into realities. But you should never forget it is a dream after all. It is a joy to make it a reality, but don't forget that it remains a dream -- and sooner or later it disappears.

If this awareness is there, then after each change in your life you will find yourself becoming sharper, more intelligent, more mature; becoming more alert to the very delicate nuances of existence -- and with tremendous acceptance of whatever happens.

My whole life I have seen many things disappearing. I have made more friends than perhaps anybody has ever made. But somebody is a friend today -- tomorrow it is finished. He finds some path on a crossroad and separates. But I have always taken it for granted that we are only travelers -- one never knows how long someone is going to be with you. While someone is with you, give as much love as you can, share as much as you can. Tomorrow perhaps you will have to say goodbye to the person.

My whole life I have been going from one place to another place because something has failed. But I have not failed. Thousands of dreams can fail -- that does not make me a failure. On the contrary, each dream disappearing makes me more victorious because it does not disturb me, does not even touch me. Its disappearance is an advantage, is an opportunity to learn to be mature. Then the best will be coming out of you. And whatever happens will not make any difference -- your best will go on growing to higher peaks.

But never try to succeed against time, against life, against existence. Always remain in a let-go. Then one is never defeated, is never in a state of failure. And there is nothing to hide because there is no clinging to anything to make it permanent -- any relationship, any friendship, any activity, anything -- there is no desire to cling to it as long as things happen which you enjoy. You open yourself, you allow the juice of those moments to fill your being, and when those moments are gone you are always grateful, never complaining.

If the disappearing dreams leave you in gratitude, then the best is going to grow in you. I have never looked back.

Just the other day at evening darshan time a few people were very happy and enthusiastic, and they said, "Bhagwan, we have come from Jabalpur." And the only thing that came to my mind was that my time there has been left so far away and so far back that not even a memory has remained. Yes, I lived a dream there also, and just as all dreams fail, it failed.

And I have been doing that my whole life -- I'm still doing that. I will go on doing that until my last breath, undefeated. That undefeatedness I find to be one's victory. In that undefeatedness -- that every time you make something, time changes it, life starts flowing in a different direction, things start happening that you had not expected....

The unknown is continuously entering your known world and disturbing it. But it disturbs only because you don't welcome it. If you can welcome the unknown, and you can leave the known.... It is always the known that is disturbed by time -- it is not the unknown. The unknown cannot be disturbed by time or by anything.

If you are ready to welcome the unknown, you know the secret of remaining victorious in all the defeats and all the failures.

Those dreams do not matter. What matters is how you come out of those broken dreams, those great expectations that have disappeared into thin air, you can't even find their footprints.

How do you come out of it? If you come out of it unscratched, then you have known a great secret, you have found a master key. Then nothing can defeat you, then nothing can disturb you, then nothing can make you angry

and nothing can pull you back. You are always marching into the unknown for new challenges. And all these challenges will go on sharpening the best in you.

Question 2
BELOVED OSHO,
WHAT IS HOME?

There is no home, there are only houses.
We try to make homes out of houses, but in fact, home is projection -- there is only a house -- it feels cold. We need a home: we want something cozy, something that belongs to us, something to which we belong. Something which is an extension of our being, something which we can make part of us; something which is not just a place where you live, but which becomes alive with you. A house is a dead thing; a home is a living entity, but it is a projection.
So those who are searching for a home will find themselves frustrated again and again because they will find again and again that it turns out to be only a house. Home was their idea. It was their illusion, their hallucination. It was their poetry, their romance. They have been weaving and spinning something invisible around the house which nobody else can see -- only they can see it. But it is just a mind game.
Man is born homeless, and man remains his whole life homeless. Yes, he will make many houses into homes and he will get frustrated. And man dies homeless.
To accept the truth brings a tremendous transformation. Then you don't search for a home -- because home is something there, far away, something other than you. And

everybody is searching for a home. When you see its illusoriness, then, rather than searching for a home, you will start searching for the being that is born homeless, whose destiny is homeless.

There is no way to make a home. And this is a miracle: the moment that you realize that there is no way to make a home, then this whole existence is home. Then wherever you are, you are at home; because now there is no question of making a home -- now there is no question of creating an illusion. You have accepted your homelessness, not with any unwillingness, any resistance, but joyously, because it is good that you are born without a home; otherwise that home will be an imprisonment.

Just think, if people were born with a home, they would be born imprisoned. To be homeless is to be free. It is freedom. It means there is no attachment, no obsession with anything outside; that you are not in need of getting some warmth from the outside, but that your warmth is within you. You have the source of warmth inside; you don't need it. So wherever you are -- without a home -- you are strangely at home.

The people who are searching for a home are always getting into despair, and finally are going to feel, "We have been cheated, life has cheated us. Somehow it gave us the desire to find a home -- and there is no home at all, it simply does not exist."

We try in every possible way: one finds a husband, one finds a wife, one brings children into the world.... One tries to create a family -- that is a psychological home. One makes, not a house, but tries to make it almost a living entity. He tries to make a house according to his dreams --

that it is going to be a fulfillment of warmth, that in this coldness.... And it is vast, the coldness of existence. The whole universe is so cold, so indifferent, that you want to create a small shelter for yourself where you can feel that you are taken care of, that something protects you... that it is something that belongs to you -- you are an owner, not a homeless wanderer.

But in reality this kind of idea is going to create misery for you because one day you will find that the husband you have lived with, the wife you have lived with -- is a stranger. Even after living together for fifty years, the strangeness has not disappeared; on the contrary, it has deepened. You were less strangers on the first day you met. As time has passed and you have been together, you have become more and more strangers to each other, because you have come to know each other more and more -- and now you don't understand at all who the other person is. The more you have known, the less you know. It seems that the more you have become acquainted with the person, the more you become aware that your ignorance about the other is absolute... there is no way to destroy it.

Your children -- you have thought they were your children, and one day you find they are not your children. You have been just a passage they have come through. They have their own lives -- they are absolutely strangers. They don't belong to you. They will find their own ways and their own lives.

Who is with you? Nobody is with anybody. You are in a crowd always, but alone. Either alone or in the crowd makes no difference: either in a home or just a wanderer -- it makes no difference.

I have never had a home. When I left my father's house for the last time, I told him, "I will not be coming back again, because this was only a commitment to my maternal grandmother. She had a promise from me that I would come back at least at the time of her death. So just to keep the promise, I have come. Now there is no longer any commitment."

My father said, "You always say strange things -- this is your home!"

I said, "That's where we differ. Neither is it my home nor is it your home. But you continue to live in an illusion and one day you will understand that this is not home." And I told him a famous Sufi story I have told many times.

The king heard one night the sound of footsteps, somebody walking on the roof of his palace. He could not believe it. The palace was so well guarded -- how had somebody reached the top?

He shouted, "Who are you?"

And the man on the roof shouted, "You should ask it of yourself first: who are you?"

The king rushed out and called the guards to catch hold of the man, but he was not found. And the next day, again there was a stranger. But the king recognized the voice -- it was the same man. And the strange behavior that he had shown the night before... to walk on the roof and then to talk in such a way, and to say to the king, "First you should ask, who are you? You don't even know that and you are worried about me! You do your business -- I'm doing mine."

The man was fighting with the guard at the gate of the palace and saying, "I want to stay in this caravanserai for a few days."
The guard was saying again and again, "You seem to be an absolute idiot; this is not a caravanserai! This is the palace of the king, his home!"
And the man said, "Then I would like to see the man who lives in such an illusion."
The king was listening: he recognized the voice. He called the guard and said, "Bring that man in." And he asked him, "Are you the same man who was on the roof?"
The man said, "Yes."
"And what were you doing there?"
He said, "My camel was lost, so I was searching for it."
He said, "You seem to be really mad! Your camel was lost on my roof? Has anybody ever heard of camels getting lost on the roofs of houses? And now you are fighting with my guard and calling my home a caravanserai! This is very disrespectful to me: I am the king, and this is my home, and you have to learn how to behave!"
And the man started laughing. He said, "Strange! You are telling me to learn how to behave, and you don't know at all what behavior means! Because I came here once before, and I found another man in your place. He was also saying that this is his home. I had come before that too, and there was another man and he was also saying that this is his home. Now you are saying this is your home!"
The king said, "That man was my father, who has died. And the first time you came you met my grandfather."
The stranger said, "That is what I wanted to make clear to you, that they called this their home, and then they had to

leave it behind. They could not take it with them. It is a caravanserai. This is an understanding, that many people have been here who thought it was their home, and they are all gone. You will be gone when I come next time! When so many people stay here and come and go, this is a caravanserai!"

"And I also wanted to stay for a few days, so what is wrong? You will stay a few days, your father stayed a few days, his father stayed a few days, and this has been going on for centuries. But I am not illusioned: to me it is a caravanserai."

I told my father, "One day you will also understand that this is not home, because in this world we are born and the day we are born, we start dying. You can call your homes your graves, but you cannot call them homes, because you are only dying in them, you are not living!"

And since then I have been in many houses which people thought were my homes, and I have been telling them that they were not, that there is no possibility.

It is good to understand that we are wanderers, gypsies -- searching for something, certainly. But the search can either be for a home... that means some security, some warmth, some coziness, some love from the outside, from somebody else -- and that is the wrong way. That is the way of the worldly man -- and he always ends in misery.

A sannyasin basically recognizes the fact that the search is not for a home, the search is for: who is this being? -- the being who is born homeless, and will remain always homeless.

Don't search for the home, because there is none. Search for your self, because there is one! And finding that one,

suddenly, miraculously, the whole existence becomes your home. And you don't create it, you don't project it, you don't make it. Suddenly it is a revelation. You cannot believe how you have been missing it up to now. The home was always where you were.

The gypsies have a better name in the Indian language. The gypsies are basically from Rajputana in India. They got the name "gypsy" because they first went out of India to Egypt and from Egypt they entered Europe. It is Egypt that gave them the name "gypsy" -- from Egypt. But they are really people from India, and in India their name is "khanabadosh."

That name has tremendous beauty. It means a person whose home is on his shoulders; so wherever he goes, he is always at home. The word khanabadosh is tremendously significant: khana means "home", badosh means "on your own shoulders".

It is not visible, it is there, but it is revealed only to those who can find who this wanderer is, who this seeker is. Rather than going after the sought, search for the seeker. And finding the seeker, you suddenly find the whole existence is your home; wherever you are, you are at home, even in a hotel. Because every house is a hotel and every place is a caravanserai.

So it is a question of how you look at things.

When I was in India, I was at home; when I was in America, I was at home. When I am in Nepal, I am at home. And tomorrow I don't know where life may take me, but wherever it takes me, I will be at home. That, nobody can take away from me for the simple reason that I am not making any projection which can taken away.

Just finding yourself, you find that the whole existence is your home.

Light on the Path

Chapter #9

Chapter title: The master's function is not to save you
8 January 1986 pm in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
I LOVE TO HEAR YOU CALL US YOUR FRIENDS.
WHY IS IT BOTH EXCITING AND CHALLENGING?

It has many implications.
It was twenty-five centuries ago that Gautam Buddha said as a departing message to his disciples before he died: "I will come back after twenty-five centuries. My name will be Maitreya."
Maitreya means the friend. And why should it be the name of Buddha? -- because the spiritual evolution of man has passed through many stages. Its ultimate stage is where the master and the disciple should be just friends... because the whole idea of the master and the disciple is based on a subtle spiritual slavery. The disciple surrenders. The master provides all kinds of devices so that the disciple disappears as an ego. But there are dangers.
The danger is -- and it is not only theoretical; the danger is very practical, and it has happened almost all over the world throughout the centuries -- that instead of the ego

disappearing, the individual disappears and the ego remains. Instead of disappearing, it becomes very subtle; it becomes holy, it becomes religious, it becomes spiritual. The individual disappears in surrender -- and that was not the purpose. The individual has to become more individual, more independent, more himself. The ego has to disappear -- it is a false entity deceiving everybody as your true self. And unless the false is discredited, the true cannot appear. In the death of the false is the beginning of the true. Surrender is simply a device so that the ego can be dropped and you can become yourself. But this is the trouble, that with humanity you cannot be very predictable. There is almost a possibility that everything will fail, so deep is the ignorance of man, so deceptive is his own mind. And he is so caught up with his own chains that he thinks they are ornaments; he does not want to throw them. They have been with him so long that he has become identified with them.

Man has forgotten who he truly is. He has almost become autohypnotized with a certain idea about himself, and he carries that idea his whole life without knowing that it is not he but only his shadow. And you cannot fulfill your shadow. A shadow is nonexistential -- you cannot make anything out of it. Your effort will simply destroy your whole life; hence the device of surrender.

But again man's ignorance is there: he surrenders, but he surrenders the wrong thing. He saves the ego, which was to be surrendered, and he surrenders the individuality, which was to be saved. And he starts feeling himself to be a spiritual being just by becoming a disciple, an initiate. And

if by chance he has come across a great master, he starts projecting himself as a great disciple of a great master.
Gautam Buddha's whole life's experience was that finally the device of surrender has to be dropped, because in the majority of cases it has not been of any help, it has been a hindrance. This was his whole life's experience -- seeing people changing the color of their ego. From a worldly ego it becomes an otherworldly ego; from a materialistic ego it becomes a spiritualistic ego -- which is far more dangerous. The first one was very gross; it was easy to see it and to catch hold of it. The second is more difficult because it is more subtle, it will elude you.
Hence Buddha's last message was: "When I come back again, I will come not as a master to you, and you will not be a disciple to me; I will come as a friend. And you have to rise to the standard of being a friend of a buddha." A great challenge to the whole tradition of initiation, to the whole relationship of master and disciplehood. He could see that it has helped once in a while but in most cases it has blocked people's growth.
And we can see that he was right. There are millions of people in the world who think they are religious, they are spiritual, they are saints, they are great spiritual beings. All that is nothing but feeding the ego. They have gone far away from their real being.
One thing is to be remembered: Gautam Buddha cannot come back. He has said, "I will be coming back." That's purely symbolic -- he cannot come back. A man of that stature, a being who has reached to the ultimate experience of existence cannot come back; it is just not possible in the very nature of things. He cannot take another form, another

body. He cannot be born again in the womb of a mother; he cannot become again flesh and bones. Once you have reached the state of being where you realize yourself as pure consciousness, it is no longer possible for you to be born again.

So when Buddha says, "Next time when I come back..." it has to be understood only symbolically. All the Buddhists of the world have been waiting -- they are waiting unnecessarily. They will never find Gautam Buddha back in the body again. And if they can find him back in the body again, then he was not a real buddha in the first place. This is the dilemma: he can be born again only if he was not a buddha, if he was not yet awakened.

Once you are awakened, you cannot dream again; you can dream only in sleep. You cannot dream again -- and all our lives are just dreams and we are fast asleep.

The Buddhists have missed the symbolic meaning. When Gautam Buddha said, "When I will be coming back," he simply meant the next time when there is an awakened man -- and the quality of two awakened men doesn't differ. There is not even a bit of difference. So he is perfectly right in saying , "I will come back."

In fact, each time a man is awakened, Buddha will be coming back in this sense -- that it is the same consciousness again. Again the same flower has blossomed, and the same fragrance and the same message! He sees it, that within twenty-five centuries man will be capable of taking the buddha as a friend.

It is a great challenge, because when you accept the buddha as a friend, there are two possibilities: either you have to pull the buddha down to the state where you are, or you

have to rise to the state where the buddha is. The challenge is that you cannot pull the buddha back down to the state where you are; that is simply impossible. You cannot in any way bring him down to the darkness and to the depth and to the blindness where you live. You will have to rise to his sunlit peaks. It is a tremendous challenge.

And in rising to become capable of really being a friend of the awakened one, you will have to drop many things on the way -- those same things which were expected to be dropped by surrender. You will have to drop all kinds of burdens. The higher you go, the less burdened you will have to be. At the highest peak of consciousness you reach just naked, like an innocent child -- not even with clothes. Even that is too much of a burden.

I have called you my friends... the same challenge.

And exactly after twenty-five centuries, Gautam Buddha is not back in one sense, but is back in another sense. Whenever, wherever anybody becomes awakened, it is the same taste, the same sweetness, the same joy, the same bliss, the same silence.

Can you tell any difference between the light of two candles? Light is simply light -- to which candle it belongs is immaterial. Its function is to destroy darkness -- that's the only meaning of light.

So whoever becomes light has now the responsibility to raise humanity from the old, traditional way of surrendering to a master, because that has created many kinds of spiritual slaveries around the world. It has not enlightened man, it has darkened his soul.

The very effort of becoming a friend... and something starts changing in you, because you are trying to reach the moon.

The moon cannot come to you, but you can reach the moon. The moon can give the invitation. The moon can call your very being -- provoke you, challenge you, inspire you -- but it cannot come to you. You have to travel the whole path.

And it is easier and it is simpler when the master is a friend, because now between you and the master the relationship is of love.

Friendship is the purest love.

It is the highest form of love where nothing is asked for, no condition, where one simply enjoys giving. One gets much -- but that is secondary, and that happens of its own accord.

To create a state of love between the master and the disciple means we are avoiding the device of surrender; instead we are making the disciple responsible. Surrender becomes, in most of the cases, an irresponsibility... because the disciple thinks, "I have surrendered to the master -- now it is his responsibility to change me, to transform me, to take me to the heights where he belongs." He starts thinking in terms of the master as the savior, that "I have found the savior; now I will believe and have faith in him and he is to save me."

That's what all the religions of the world are doing. They have found the savior, and they have dropped all their responsibility. Now it is the duty of Jesus or Krishna or Buddha to take you in their arms and carry you into the highest state of being.

Now, this is not possible. Nobody can take you to the ultimate; you will have to go on your own, alone. The master's function is not to save you: his function is to show you the path. You have to save yourself.

Except for you there is no one who can become your savior.

People have never thought about it: The moment you think somebody else can save you, you are becoming dependent on somebody else. And dependence is not the right way to reach to the high peaks of consciousness, independence -- total independence -- freedom. You are cutting your wings with your own hands, and now you will not be able to fly to the moon.

The moment you think of your master as a friend, you save him from the responsibility of being your savior, and you save yourself by becoming responsible, by taking the whole path -- its difficulties, its beauties, its anguishes and its ecstasies... accepting everything with tremendous responsibility.

You are alone, and alone you have to seek and search. And only in your ultimate aloneness will you find it. The master can only show you the path. He is only a finger pointing to the moon. He is certainly a great friend because what he is indicating to you is the greatest bliss in life.

Existence moves in two ways. One is the horizontal way, like a straight line moving from A to B, from B to C, up to X Y Z. You start becoming more and more alive.

Perhaps at point A you were just a stone. Yes, there is some kind of life in the rocks too, because they grow. The Himalayas are still growing higher, every year one foot. They are still young and still full of energy to go higher. They are the highest mountains in the world -- seem to be inexhaustible in energy, as if they want to touch the stars.

I was born near a mountain which is the oldest mountain in the world, Vindhyachal. It came out of the ocean at the

very beginning -- the first mountain in the world. It is the oldest; ancient... it has stopped growing for millions of years. It is so old that there is a beautiful story about it. One great sage was going to deliver his message towards the south -- Vindhyachal is just in the middle of India -- and for the old sage to cross the mountain was really difficult. Seeing the difficulty of the old sage, Vindhyachal bent down, just as if somebody were touching your feet, and allowed the way to the sage. And the sage said, "Remain as you are, because I will have to come back again, and by that time I will be even older. So please wait for me!" But the sage never came back; he died in the south, so Vindhyachal is still bent.

I have been to the place where the sage went; it is still bent like an old man. But it is the most ancient; nothing grows, it has come to a full stop. But it did grow sometime in the past.

The Himalayas are the newest mountains, the latest mountains in the world to have come out of the ocean. They are still growing, becoming higher and higher.

Even rocks grow, so don't think they don't have life; but the life is very dormant, very deeply asleep -- not even a dream, just darkness and deep sleep. But it is still life, maybe the most primitive -- at point "A" of a horizontal line.

So there in the horizontal line is man. And there are men ahead of you, but they are not higher than you. There is Albert Einstein -- he is ahead of you, you may perhaps be miles back, but it is the same line... a linear progress. The difference between you and him may be miles, but it is the same road. Even if somebody reaches the very end of the

line, reaches Z, then too he becomes at the most Zorba the Greek.

I have loved the name "Zorba the Greek" for so many reasons. One is because Z is the last letter in the alphabet. He is the Z; he is the end of the line. He is more alive than any man, but his aliveness does not make him higher than you. His aliveness is more like a wild animal -- innocent but ignorant; full of energy, vitality, but blind, with no eyes to see. Yes, he can dance, but his dance will not have anything of divineness in it. It will be tremendously powerful but it will remain earthly.

The horizontal line moves on the earth. You can become at the most Zorba the Greek, but your unconsciousness will still be your life; you will still be groping in darkness. You will still be unaware that there is another dimension also -- the vertical dimension.

The vertical dimension moves from A to a higher A. It goes on moving higher, but it remains the same energy, A becoming purified, becoming more conscious, becoming more alert; ultimately becoming fully conscious. It does not move from A to B, from B to C; it simply moves from A1 to A2, to A3, to A4. At point A4 something happens that we call the awakened one.

Life moving horizontally remains simply life; life moving vertically becomes consciousness.

It becomes consciousness, it becomes a new phenomenon. Horizontal life always has a goal to it, it is goal-oriented. When you are at B, your eyes are focused on C. When you are at point B, you are not there at all; either you are thinking of point A that you have left behind -- your past, all your yesterdays, your memories -- or you are projecting

into the future: B, C, E... up to Z, a whole long line of goals.

Your mind is either in the yesterdays or in the tomorrows, but it is never herenow. You are never where you are; you are always somewhere else, where you are not.

This is the whole tension of the human mind, that it is always absent where it is actually present, and it is present where it is not actually present -- and cannot ever be present in any possible way.

If you are at point B, you are at point B: you can only think of C, you can imagine it. You can have memories of the past and you can have imaginations of the future -- but you are in the present.

The vertical line moves from the present. First you have to be herenow. Wherever you are, you have to be exactly there -- no memories, no imagination -- and suddenly there is a transformation, because when there is no memory, no imagination, all your energy is accumulated in this small moment. And this moment is so small, it cannot contain it. That's what brings transformation.

It brings an explosion, like an atomic explosion. The present moment explodes: suddenly life becomes consciousness. You start moving upwards, from consciousness to superconsciousness, from superconsciousness to the collective superconsciousness, from the collective superconsciousness to cosmic superconsciousness. And that is A4: cosmic superconsciousness is the state of the awakened person, the buddha.

To be the friend of the awakened master means to transform the very quality of your life, to change its

dimension from the horizontal to the vertical. It is a beginning of living in the moment -- suddenly you will find Buddha is not so far away, he is just very close to you -- only three steps, and he is the fourth.

In the East we have called that state "the fourth." We have not given it any name; we have given it a number, not a name. We have called it turiya; turiya means the fourth. This is the only experience which has not been given a meaningful name but only a number. It is significant. Why did they give it a number? -- because no word can explain it. It is such a mysterious experience that all words fail, all explanations become meaningless. Nothing can be said about it; only silence can give you a taste of it. Hence no specific name has been given to it, but only a number to indicate that in this world names cannot enter.

Wherever you are on the horizontal line, there are millions of things ahead of you to achieve, and whatever you can achieve, still there will be millions of things to achieve. So everybody remains a beggar -- everybody without exception. Wherever he is, he remains a beggar, for the simple reason that he is never fulfilled. There is much more that is ahead of him, there is much more that others have. Even the greatest king, even the greatest rich man, even the greatest, most knowledgeable person cannot claim everything because there are millions of things. The king may be the greatest king, he may be Alexander the Great, but in many things he is a poor man.

When Alexander the Great met Diogenes, a naked sage -- just looking at Diogenes, he felt jealous. Alexander the Great, who has conquered the whole known world, feels jealous of a naked man, for the simple reason that that

naked man seems so contented, such a peace surrounds him! He has nowhere to go, he has nothing -- and yet it seems he has everything. And Alexander cannot forget Diogenes -- he remembers Diogenes again and again.
He cannot forget, because that man was far richer, and there is no way... you can conquer the whole world but you cannot become Diogenes. And Diogenes laughed when Alexander met with him, and he told him, "You are unnecessarily feeling jealous, because whatever I have got, you can have it -- just drop this race of conquering the world. You will die exhausted, spent, and you will die a beggar."
And Alexander died when he was only thirty-three -- spent, because continuously fighting, he burned himself out too quickly. And the day he died -- because he remembered Diogenes saying, "You will die a beggar" -- he told his prime minister and his generals, "This is my last will, and take care that it should be fulfilled. My hands should be hanging out of the casket. When you carry my dead body to the graveyard, my hands should be hanging out."
"But," they said, "this is not done! A strange kind of thing you are asking. And people will ask us, `Why are his hands hanging out?' -- because it has never been done before. What are we going to say to them?"
Alexander said, "Tell them that my hands are empty. I came with empty hands and I am going with empty hands -- I am dying a beggar. Diogenes was right. Let the whole world know that I spent myself, burned myself out, unnecessarily rushing after shadows."
Yes, he became a world conqueror but he could not have even the peace and the silence of a naked beggar who had

nothing. Gautam Buddha at least used to have a begging bowl....

Diogenes also had a begging bowl, but one day he was rushing to the river -- he was feeling thirsty -- with his begging bowl, to fill it with water and drink it. Just by his side a dog was running; it got there before Diogenes and started drinking directly from the river.

Diogenes said, "My God, this dog is far ahead of me! He does not even need a begging bowl; he has defeated me -- I am finished with my begging bowl!" He dropped the begging bowl in the river and started drinking water the way the dog was drinking. That was his last possession; after that he never possessed anything.

A man who had nothing in the world, not even a begging bowl -- which a beggar is allowed to have -- still he made emperors jealous. Just looking at his eyes, just the light in his eyes... the very sparkle of the man was stunning. The silence of the man and his small statements, but with such great meaning....

Alexander, leaving him, asked, "Can I do anything for you? I am really impressed, I have never come across a man like you. I would love to do something; you say anything and it will be done." And Diogenes said, "Just stand to one side because I am taking a sunbath and you are blocking my sun."

Diogenes was sitting on a bank in the sands, naked, taking a sunbath. And he said, "It would be very kind of you if you can just stand a little to one side -- that's more than enough. What else do I need? I have got everything."

The man who says, "I have got everything," is not speaking of the things of this world -- because Diogenes had nothing

of this world. He is speaking of another dimension, of another richness, of another kingdom: he is talking about "the fourth." He is talking about a vertical growth.

To be a friend of the awakened master is a great challenge. But the distance is not far; you have just to change your dimension. If you go on moving on the horizontal line, then you will be moving farther and farther away from the master and his state of mind, his consciousness. To be a friend you have to turn and become vertical-just the way a tree grows: vertical, higher -- not flowing like a river, which is horizontal.

Every person has the potential at every moment to change the dimension of his life. It is simply a decision, a commitment -- not to anyone else but to your own self. It is just a decision: that "I have accepted the master, the awakened being, as my friend -- now I have to prove it." Nobody else can do it for you, only you will have to prove it.

It is certainly a most exciting experience... to come closer and closer to the master's being, and to come to the experience of the fourth state of consciousness. Then suddenly all the mysteries of existence are available to you. All the questions disappear. Then suddenly you are the answer.

There is no question mark, there is no quest; you are not going anywhere anymore -- you have arrived. It was so close; it was within you -- and you have been carrying it all along for many, many lives; you had just never looked at it. It was your treasure, and it was for you only. It has been waiting for many lives within you. It will wait for eternity because nobody else can claim it.

Any moment it is yours -- you have just to decide to turn from the goal-oriented, ambitious world where you are always looking for more and more. And you are capable of getting more and more, but your dissatisfaction remains, your desire for more continues. There never comes a point when you can say that now the desire for more has disappeared. The more you have, the more you want, the desire goes on growing more.

An ancient parable is that a king had a massagist, a poor man, who used to come to massage the king every day; he was the best massagist in the capital. He used to get just one gold coin every day, and that was more than enough. He lived like the richest man in the world. In those days, a gold coin every day... no care for tomorrow. He was the happiest man, the king never found him sad -- and the king was always sad because there were so many problems and no way to solve them, and they were continuously increasing, and the enemies and the wars... problems upon problems.

And this man had nothing but... he gets only one coin every morning, and that's all. And he does not go anywhere else -- his work is finished in the morning, then the whole day he enjoys. He used to play on the flute -- he used to live just in front of the king's palace in a small hut. In the middle of the night when the king was overburdened with all his worries, the massagist would be playing on his flute. In the full-moon night when everything was beautiful, the king was just anxiety and nothing else.

He was very jealous of this massagist, because this poor man got only one coin every day from him and he was

enjoying life like a king; and the king could not even enjoy life like the massagist.

He asked his prime minister, who was a wise old man, "What is the secret? I can't understand why he is so joyful, always singing, playing the flute, and always happy. And whenever he comes I have never seen any sadness in the man, not even the shadow of it."

The prime minister said, "You wait just a few days." In the night the prime minister threw a bag full of ninety-nine gold coins into the massagist's house.

In the morning, when he was getting up and getting ready to go to the king, the massagist found the bag. He was puzzled. He counted the coins and he said, "My God, ninety-nine coins! What am I going to do with so many coins? -- one is more than enough."

But he became worried. That day he was not so happy as every other day. The king said, "What is the matter?"

He said, "Nothing; it is just that I have got into trouble. Somebody has thrown a bag of ninety-nine coins into my house, and since I counted those coins in that bag my whole life is destroyed. It is just this morning that my whole life has been ruined, because I am worried. I have never been worried."

The king said, "But why should you be worried?"

He said, "I am worried because I am thinking that it will be good now to save one coin today; I am going to try to make one hundred exactly. Today I am going to remain hungry because I cannot eat, I cannot purchase my food. And today you will not be listening to my flute because a hungry man cannot play on the flute. And the idea persists, that it will

be good to make the number exactly one hundred." And since that day the man was a different man.

The old prime minister told the king, "Now do you know the secret? Up to now he had no desire for more; now there is a problem. When he has one hundred he will think that now if he can save one more, he will have one hundred and one. And now he is in a vicious circle; he will never be out of it. Those ninety-nine coins have destroyed his whole life; he will remain miserable. Now you will see him every day becoming more and more miserable."

The world of "more" is the world of the ordinary man. The world of not going after the more, not going after any goal ahead of you but just looking in the moment where you are, who you are, and taking a plunge into the presentness of your consciousness -- this is the only revolution, and the only religion, and the only spirituality there is. And it is so close, only three steps. And it all depends on you.

To be the friend of the master means you have accepted the challenge: that you will rise above yourself, and you will go on rising until you reach the point where you are synonymous with the consciousness of the master. Only then is the pilgrimage of the friendship with the awakened one fulfilled.

It is the greatest challenge, but once accepted, it brings you to the greatest blessing possible to human beings.

I would love not to be your master, but just to be your friend, and give you the challenge. I cannot come to the valley of darkness, but you can come to the world of stars and light.

I can call you, invite you, challenge you, provoke you. I can show you the way -- but you will have to walk. Nobody

else can walk on your behalf. And that's what for centuries we have been hoping: somebody else will do it for us. That's why it has not happened; it has happened only to a few people who have walked themselves. The whole humanity has remained in misery because they have been waiting for the savior to come.

The savior never comes. He is always there at the sunlit peaks, calling. It is not the same person always; the person goes on changing, but there is always someone on the sunlit peaks calling you forth. It is the same voice. The face may be different, the body may be different, but it is the same source. All the buddhas are the same; their message is the same, their mission is the same. Their language may differ but their indications are always to the same path.

Move from the past and the future to the present. Bring your whole energy to the present moment; and the present moment is so small that you need not do anything else -- just that much energy in that small moment is bound to explode. That explosion becomes light, and you are suddenly moved one step ahead, from conscious to superconscious. Then you know -- because it is the same step and it is the same movement.

If you have taken one step.... The ancient sages of China have a proverb: "One step is half the journey" -- because if you have taken one step, the journey is finished really, because you know now the secret of how this one step has been taken. Now go on gathering your energies more and more in the present, again and again, and there will be bigger explosions.

The fourth explosion and you are no more -- and you are for the first time, both together. You are no more as an ego,

and you are for the first time as an individual. You are no longer a separate personality in existence; you are no longer a dewdrop, you are the whole ocean. And each step is such a joy that the very joy goes on taking you further and further.
Only the first step is difficult; then there is nothing difficult. You have the master key in your hands.

Light on the Path

Chapter #10
Chapter title: I love the rascal saints
9 January 1986 pm in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
IS THERE A POSSIBILITY THAT A SAINT CAN BE A RASCAL?

The question reminds me of a small story -- it happened in a Christian monastery. Two monks were discussing in the garden of the monastery -- every day they were given one hour to walk in the garden and meditate on God.... They were discussing, "Is it possible to smoke while walking in the garden?"
They were not in the church, they were not in the monastery; they were outside the church, outside the monastery. Both decided it would be better to ask the abbot of the monastery. Next day, the first was sitting under a tree

very dejected, very sad, and the other came along, smoking a cigarette. The first could not believe it.
He said, "It seems you have not asked the abbot, because I asked, and he was very angry, and he refused me absolutely. How is it that you are smoking?"
The second monk said, "What did you ask the abbot?"
The sad man said, "I asked simply, `Is it possible to smoke while contemplating God?' And he said, `No, absolutely no!'"
The second man laughed, and he said, "That's why! I asked him, `Can I contemplate God while smoking?' And he said, `Yes, of course!'"
It is absolutely impossible for a saint to be a rascal -- but a rascal can be a saint.
It is absolutely impossible for a saint because the very definition of the saint does not include any possibility of being a rascal. The saint is thought to be a simple, truthful, sincere and very serious seeker of truth. He is one-dimensional.
To find the truth he abandons everything, he renounces the world; he renounces his own body, his own feelings, his own emotions. He becomes almost bodiless. He is in the world but he belongs to the world no more. He has turned his back upon the world.
This has been praised for centuries, but there is something which has been overlooked -- that this type of person is flat. He has no colors, he is like a very ancient, antique, faded painting. He is just surviving, not living. He has chosen an anti-life attitude. He rejects life to gain spirituality. Necessarily, rejecting life, he rejects everything that is implied in life -- all its colors, all its songs, all its beauties,

all its joys. It is a tremendous phenomenon. He becomes dry, juiceless -- just a skeleton, waiting for death so that he can be released from the body completely.

Of course, he cannot be a rascal.

But there have been rascals who became great saints: Chuang Tzu in China, Hotei in Japan, Bodhidharma in India; and in this very century, George Gurdjieff in the West... just to mention the very great and very significant people of tremendous importance as saints. But you cannot include them in the ordinary concept of the saint.

They are very colorful people, very alive, living intensely. They have not renounced the world; they do not see the need to renounce it. Because God has not renounced the world, why should they renounce the world? And God loves all these colors and these flowers and these birds and these songs and these people. Existence is multi-dimensional. It accommodates, it is very compassionate. It will not prevent a rascal from becoming a saint. Of course the very quality of the rascal's being will be totally transformed.

Chuang Tzu remained an enigma to all the religious people in China for centuries because of his behavior, his statements, his absurd stories which nobody can think of as being holy in any way. They certainly contain something holier than the so-called holy books, but to perceive it one needs great insight.

One morning Chuang Tzu was sitting, very sad, by the side of his bed. His disciples had never seen him sad, and they asked him what had happened.

He said, "I am in such trouble that I don't see how I will be able to solve it in this life or ever."

Everybody was eager to know about the problem that Chuang Tzu could not solve. He was one of the greatest philosophers, and whenever they came with great problems, he had never said that they could not be solved; he had answers for every question. So what could be the problem?

Chuang Tzu said, "The problem is, in the night I dreamed that I have become a butterfly."

They all laughed; they said, "It was just a dream! Where is the problem?"

Chuang Tzu said, "You have not heard the whole thing. Now I am wondering: perhaps the butterfly has gone to sleep and is dreaming that she has become Chuang Tzu! Now, what is the truth? Did Chuang Tzu become a butterfly in the dream, or did the butterfly become Chuang Tzu in the dream? Who am I?"

It is perfectly logical. If a man can become a butterfly in a dream, there seems to be no contradiction; a butterfly can become a man in a dream. What is reality?

And he has written these kinds of parables -- absurd. You cannot solve them, they are basically unsolvable. He was asked why he goes on writing such stuff -- "Because we have never heard religious people writing such things. They write about God, they write about heaven, about hell; they write about how to live your life. And you write things that disturb us! They don't help us."

And he said, "Unless you are totally disturbed you will not be reborn. Unless you are so disturbed that nothing of you remains undisturbed, you will not find yourself; you will not find that space which nothing can disturb. I go on writing these stories to disturb you.

"I am not here to give consolation to you. For consolation you can go to ordinary saints. I disturb, and I disturb totally, to the point where you have a nervous breakdown, because unless you have a breakdown, you can't have a breakthrough."

Very few people had the courage to remain with Chuang Tzu. He was creating situations which were very embarrassing. Saints are not supposed to do such things. For example, he was found one day in the capital sitting on a donkey, his disciples following him, and the whole town laughing. And the people are gathered on both sides... because he is not sitting in the right way, he is sitting looking at his disciples and the donkey is going forward and he is looking backward! The people are laughing and the disciples are feeling very embarrassed.

Finally one disciple said, "Why are you doing it? You are making a fool of yourself! And with you we are becoming idiots unnecessarily -- people are thinking we are idiots!"

Chuang Tzu said, "There is something great implied in it. I have thought it over and over: if I sit the way people sit on donkeys, then my back will be towards you, and that is insulting. And I don't want to insult anybody, not even my own disciples. There is a possibility that you can be in front of me, but then you will be insulting me -- and that is not right at all, disciples insulting the master.

"So this is the solution that I have found. Let the fools laugh -- but I am facing you, you are facing me. That's how a master and disciple should be; and I am respectful towards you, and you are respectful towards me. And the donkey has no objection -- why should we bother about the people?"

Now this kind of man is rare, unique, difficult to find. But he attained to the highest clarity, consciousness, love, compassion -- but he remained a rascal to the very end.
I mentioned the name of Hotei. He was just on his deathbed, and he asked his disciples, "Can somebody suggest to me a way to die which has never happened before? -- because I don't want to die in the ordinary and common way. For example, most people die lying in their bed.
"And," Hotei said, "that's why I never lie in bed because that is the most dangerous place: ninety-nine percent of people die there! So I have been sleeping on the floor my whole life to avoid that place.
"But I would like to die in my own way, just the way I have lived my life in my own way: not caring at all what others say but simply living spontaneously, out of my own being, out of my own insight. Whether I am condemned or whether I am disrespected -- that I have never cared about. But I am worried -- I need some suggestion from you."
Somebody suggested, "You could die standing."
He said, "The idea is good!"
Then one of the disciples said, "But it is not very original, because I have heard of a great rascal saint just like you who died standing. So it will not be very unique and original."
Somebody suggested, "Then the best way is, die standing on your head! We don't think that anybody has done that before. It is going to be unique -- never done before and perhaps never in the future."
Hotei said, "I like the idea!" Even at the point of death he stood on his head. And it is said that the disciples were at a

loss to figure out what to do now. Because they knew what to do when a person dies in the bed, but what to do with the master who has died standing on his head?
Somebody said that his sister, who was older than him -- she was a nun, just as he was a monk, and she lived nearby.... "It is better to ask her; we should not do anything before asking somebody who is in a better position and is a better authority." The elder sister was called.
She came up and she said, "Hotei, you rascal! Your whole life you have been this way -- but at least behave at the point of death! Get up and lie down on the bed!"
Naturally, when the elder sister says so.... Hotei jumped up, laughed, lay down on the bed and died!
But this kind of saint is a very unique phenomenon. Tradition would not accept him, religions will avoid mentioning him. Even after death he continued to be himself. Before dying he said, "Remember, I am not a traditional man, so please don't give me a bath". It was a traditional thing, that before taking him to the funeral pyre he should be given a bath. He said, "I have taken my bath in the morning so there is no need to give me a cold bath again. I hate it!" "But," they said, "you will be dead!"
He said, "Dead or alive, I hate it! And remember that you are my disciples and my will should be followed; don't remove my clothes."
Traditionally, a bath is given, and new clothes, food... because we are sending the person on a new pilgrimage, on a new journey. But he insisted. The traditional people were not even willing to participate in his funeral because they said, "This is not right -- he should be given a bath, his clothes should be changed."

But his disciples said, "We cannot deny our dead master -- and he never cared about you anyway. And we don't think he will care whether you come to the funeral or not."
They had to put his body on the pyre in his clothes... and only then did they recognize that that man was really something, one who comes only once in a while. The whole crowd of disciples started laughing, because he had hidden in his clothes -fireworks! So, many things started exploding. He made a joke even of death! He created laughter even at his funeral.
So I cannot say that a saint can be a rascal, but I can say certainly that existence is very accommodating: a rascal can be a saint, and perhaps a greater saint than your so-called ordinary saints. Your ordinary saints are ordinary human beings. They fulfill your expectations; a rascal saint never fulfills your expectations. On the contrary he goes on destroying your expectations. He functions in such a way that you cannot define him, you cannot explain him. You cannot make sense of many things in his life.
George Gurdjieff, who died only in 1950, was a contemporary man but perhaps the most rare man in this whole century. One of his disciples, Nicoll, remembers traveling with him on a train in America, when Gurdjieff started behaving as if he was a drunkard. Nicoll knew that he had not touched any drink for years -- he had been with him -- but he started behaving like a drunkard... shouting, throwing things, disturbing the whole train.
Finally the conductor came, the guard came, and Nicoll was very embarrassed. He was trying to prevent Gurdjieff -- "What are you doing?" -- but Gurdjieff wouldn't listen. He was making a fool of himself and making a fool of Nicoll.

Nicoll was even more embarrassed... because at least people thought Gurdjieff was drunk: "But you should take care of your master, and if he is drunk then you should not travel in the middle of the night. He has awakened the whole train!

"And he is not only throwing out his things, he is throwing out other people's things. You stop him; otherwise we will have to call the police at the next station."

Nicoll was trying to persuade Gurdjieff, and said, "Stop this game! Why are you unnecessarily.... I know perfectly well you are not drunk."

And Gurdjieff said into Nicoll's ear, "I know it too -- don't be worried! I have my own ways of working. You have to learn not to be embarrassed -- whatever the situation. If you are to be with me, you have to learn one thing: not to be embarrassed. It is a teaching for you; I made this whole train a teaching class for you. Why does one feel embarrassed?"

And people gathered and started listening. Suddenly Gurdjieff was not drunk, and he was talking on embarrassment and its implications. If you can drop embarrassment, there is a certain spiritual growth in you. Why is one embarrassed? -- because one wants respectability, deep down one wants everybody to think of one in nice ways, good respectable ways. When something happens which goes against respectability, there is embarrassment. It is the ego that is embarrassed.

And Gurdjieff said to Nicoll, "If you can drop embarrassment, you have dropped the ego. Now we can go to sleep."

The whole train was wondering about the man. Whatever he said was absolutely right. Many people in the morning came to visit in his compartment. They said, "Forgive us, but you have made such an impression. We had never thought that a teacher, a spiritual master, will behave in this way just to give a lesson to his disciple. But we could not sleep the whole night -- we thought about it again and again. It is true, we feel embarrassed. It is not our true self, it is just our idea of our prestige, of our status; of how people should see us, how people should know us."

We all have masks. And whenever somebody takes the mask away, suddenly you are embarrassed, because you have been hiding your original face from the whole world and suddenly you are exposed. Suddenly you find your clothes have disappeared and you are standing naked!

But only a man like Gurdjieff would do that. Once he called one of his most important and the greatest of his disciples, P.D. Ouspensky. This man, P.D. Ouspensky, was a world-famous mathematician. Nobody knew about Gurdjieff before Ouspensky became his disciple; it was his becoming initiated by Gurdjieff that made Gurdjieff's name world-famous.

Ouspensky was a world-famous mathematician. He has written one book which is thought to be one of the three great books in the whole world. He himself in that book.... It is on mathematics, higher mathematics -- but not only on mathematics, it is also on spirituality. And he is the only mathematician known up to now who has made some basic bridges between the highest flight of mathematics and spirituality.

His book's name is TERTIUM ORGANUM. It means "the third canon of thought." He writes in his introduction: "The first canon of thought was written by Aristotle; it is called ORGANUM. The second canon of thought was written by Bacon; it is called NOVUM ORGANUM -- the new canon of thought. Both have been tremendously decisive in scientific growth." Ouspensky has called his book the third canon of thought -- TERTIUM ORGANUM and he says, "Although my book is coming third, it existed before the first ever existed."

And certainly it is more fundamental than both Bacon's and Aristotle's. And it is now almost half a century old, but no other book has come which can be the fourth... perhaps it never will come. He has done such a perfect job.

This man was a professor at London University in the times of the Russian revolution, and Gurdjieff was in Russia, far away in the interior in a small place, Tiflis. Gurdjieff called Ouspensky to come immediately. And it was very dangerous: the whole of Russian life had been disturbed, the czar had been killed. Although the revolutionaries had overturned the old regime, the new regime had not yet come into existence; it was just chaos all over the country -- and it is a vast country, one sixth of the whole earth. The army was scattered and nobody knew what was happening. Trains were running on their own, or not running; there was nobody to control anything. Everything was on fire; and to move, everybody was at risk.

Gurdjieff called Ouspensky immediately, and Ouspensky dropped his well-paid job, his very respectable professorship, and went into a dangerous Russia. He was afraid that he might not be able to reach; he might be killed

-- people were being killed and butchered like anything. But somehow he managed. It took three months for him to find the village of Tiflis, but anyhow he reached there and he was happy that he had managed it.

When he entered the house of Gurdjieff, Gurdjieff said, "Good! So you have come. Now you can go back and rejoin your job." Ouspensky could not believe that Gurdjieff would do such a thing -- putting him at such risk unnecessarily. And Gurdjieff had not even said a single word! He had not even asked Ouspensky to sit down and rest a little before he left to go back. He said, "Now you can go back immediately."

Even other disciples who were there with Gurdjieff became very suspicious: this was strange! One of the disciples said, "We cannot believe what you have done! What is the meaning of it?"

Gurdjieff said, "This is the last fire test of trust -- and I don't think he will be able to pass it. I have seen on his face that he has failed; I have seen frustration. He could not go gracefully. If he had gone gracefully he would have been born anew, he would have become a new man.

"I had given him the opportunity to be reborn -- he missed."

And certainly Ouspensky missed, because he became so angry that he disconnected himself from Gurdjieff.

Even such a great thinker, mathematician, scientist, could not see that when a man like Gurdjieff does something -- howsoever absurd, meaningless -- there is bound to be some meaning in it. You should not take it at face value, you should give it a chance to sink deep. Many of Gurdjieff's disciples left him at one point or another

because they could not conceive logically what the man was doing.

A rascal saint will not behave logically, his behavior will be very illogical. But still, if you can figure out the deeper implications of his illogicality, you will be simply surprised that he is a miracle man.

For example, Gurdjieff would make the vegetarians eat meat, force them to eat meat. The person who was not drinking he would force to drink as much as possible -- till he was flat on the floor, saying things which you could have never thought that the man would say. And Gurdjieff would be listening to him.

He said, "I never believe what people say unless they are unconscious. Only in their unconsciousness do they say the truth. In their consciousness they go on saying things which are respectable, which have to be said, which are expected to be said. Only when they are unconscious are they true. Then you can see their original face. And only the original can be changed, you cannot change the false. The false does not exist, how can you change it? You can change only the real, but first you have to find it."

Gurdjieff had his own ways of finding it. But these ways are not common; hence neither Chuang Tzu nor Hotei created a religion, nor Gurdjieff, nor Bodhidharma.

Bodhidharma perhaps is the greatest of all these four. He was born in India and went to China. And his fame went ahead of him; the great Chinese emperor had come to receive him on the border. And the emperor had done great service to Buddhism -- he had made thousands of temples and thousands of monasteries, and he had thousands of

scholars translating all the Buddhist literature from Pali to Chinese.

He had put all his treasures in the service of Buddhism. He changed the whole of China to Buddhism -- his name was Emperor Wu. And naturally, every Buddhist who had come before Bodhidharma had told Emperor Wu, "You have earned great virtue. You will be born in the seventh lotus paradise, the highest paradise in Buddhist mythology. You have done such great work that there is no comparison -- even Ashoka is left far behind."

Emperor Wu, gracefully bowed down, touched the feet of Bodhidharma and asked him, "What is my virtue?"

And Bodhidharma said, "None!"

The emperor was shocked. He said, "But I have made so many temples, and I have made thousands of Buddha statues, and I feed thousands of Buddhist monks. I have changed the whole of China to Buddhism. And you say that my virtue is nil? Will I not be able to be born into the seventh lotus paradise?"

Bodhidharma laughed, he said, "You will be born in the seventh hell!"

The emperor had never seen such a man; he was accustomed to courtesy, grace -- he was a great emperor. And this man is simply hitting him so hard. He asked Bodhidharma, "Why are you so hard on me?"

Bodhidharma said, "Because I love you, and whoever I love, I am hard on him; otherwise, who cares? The people who have been telling you that you will be born in the seventh paradise don't love you, don't understand you; they are simply cheating you, because you are serving their purpose. They are giving you great promises to be fulfilled

in the other world. I cannot give you any promise unless I see the transformation happening here and now.
"You may have made thousands of temples, but you are not a temple yet. And you have made thousands of Buddha statues, but you are not a buddha yet. And the seventh lotus paradise is not for statue-makers; it is for those who have become a buddha themselves. I can make you a buddha, but I am going to be a hard man. You will have to forget completely that you are an emperor. With me no nonsense can be tolerated.
"So you go back home and think about it. If you are ready, I am always ready. But don't be befooled by these so-called Buddhist monks -- who are good people, who are simple-hearted, who are not doing any harm to anybody. But they are not masters who transform, who create a new consciousness."
And he said, "I will wait outside the town, I will not enter your empire. You will have to enter into my empire. I will wait outside. Tomorrow morning at four o'clock, before the sun rises, if you have decided that you are ready to travel the path whatever the consequences, you can come; otherwise I will move."
The whole night the emperor could not sleep... whether to go to this man? -- because he looked dangerous. And to go alone at four o'clock, in the dark.... And Bodhidharma had warned him, "Don't bring your guards or others, because you will have to go alone on the path."
Who knows? -- the man might be a little insane or something. Certainly he was dangerous! He was not the common run-of-the-mill saint. But his eyes, his gestures...! Although he was very rude, still behind his rudeness there

was great compassion. And the king thought about it again and again: To go or not to go? But he could not resist -- he had to go. The man was irresistible.

Fearing, trembling inside, still the emperor went to the temple -- Bodhidharma was staying outside the boundary of his empire. Bodhidharma said, "I knew you would come. I knew because although I was hard and rude, and you were shocked, you were not angry; you were understanding. You were puzzled -- you have never seen such a man, a very strange type of saint! But I knew that you would not be able to sleep.

"I have also not slept the whole night. I have been waiting for you. I was certain that you would come because whatever I had said was said with immense compassion and love."

This man, Bodhidharma, had very few disciples, but whoever had the courage and guts to be with this strange man was certainly transformed.

Now, Bodhidharma is not accepted by the traditional people. But this is the beauty of life: there is a traditional crowd, but there is also a small untraditional path, trodden by the rare. It is almost like walking on a sword. But these few rare people have done more as far as transformation of consciousness is concerned than millions of ordinary saints. They are good -- but good for nothing. These people may not seem the right kind, but to meet such a man is the rarest opportunity in life. They are dangerous. It is playing with fire, but unless you are ready to play with fire, you cannot expect something miraculous to happen to you.

From ordinary saints and priests and theologians, you can get only an ordinary kind of religiousness. If you get

satisfied with it, you are unfortunate. It is not enough -- not enough for any man worth calling himself a man.
I am certainly in favor of all those rare beings -- extraordinary, untraditional, strangers, outlandish -- because they can change you so quickly. Just to be near them can create a new fire in you. It is there; it just needs a little work to remove so many conditions, thoughts, conventions, which have covered it. Otherwise, everybody is carrying the fire.
But you need a surgeon, you can't just depend on simply good people to help you. You need somebody who can cut through and through and reach to your heart.
And certainly these strange people will have strange ways, because to reach to the human heart is not simple. To reach to the human mind is very simple, but to reach to the human heart is very difficult, and to reach deeper than the human heart -- to the very soul of the man, to his being -- you need rare surgeons, rare physicians. Their methods will be outlandish.
So it is a blessing to the earth that there have been a few rascal saints too. They are the very salt of the whole evolution of human consciousness.
Go for the rare, search for the unique. Only then may you be able to find a door to the unknown.
The ordinary saint is good if you want just to worship and touch his feet and give him some flowers and get his blessings. He is good -- he does no harm, he is a consolation. In a troubled society where everybody is miserable he gives you consolation. Where everybody is suffering he provides you with a certain kind of opium. He keeps you contented in a very discontented world.

But the rare saint you asked about creates discontent in you -- discontent for the divine. Your ordinary discontentment is nothing, he wants more discontent in you. He wants you to become aflame with discontent. Your very discontent will become such a fire that it will burn everything that is not necessary in you, that is not really part of you, and will bring out your radiant being in its utter beauty and nakedness.
I love the rascal saints!
Nobody has talked about them, nobody writes about them. Nobody even dares to call some saint a rascal saint. But I cannot be untruthful.
I simple call a spade a spade!

Light on the Path

Chapter #11
Chapter title: A true master can put you on fire
10 January 1986 pm in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
HOW IS IT POSSIBLE THAT YOU JUST WALK PAST A PERSON AND YOU SET THEM ON FIRE? I HAVE SEEN EVEN PEOPLE WHO DON'T KNOW THAT THEY LOVE YOU BURST INTO FLAMES.

The question is great. Life is not synonymous with logic, particularly the logic that Aristotle has given to the world. It has an appeal to the mind -- it is very simple, very

obvious, very mathematical, scientific. But the appeal to the mind of Aristotle's logic is not that it fits with existence, that it represents life. On the contrary, mind is overwhelmed by it because it fits with the split mind, and it fits perfectly. Naturally the mind is convinced.

But life is not logic. So first we have to understand the split of the mind which makes it so much impressed by a wrong logic, a logic which is not representative of existence itself. Mind has a double split. The front of the mind and the back of the mind -- that is the first split.

The front of the mind is active, and the back of the mind is inactive. The front of the mind thinks;, the back of the mind simply lives. The front of the mind is the base of all our activities, of all our achievements, of all our scientific, technological progress. The back of the mind is absolutely silent, and only meditators have known it; others have it but they are unaware of it. Unless you become inactive, so much so that there is not even the subtle activity of thoughts or emotions, you cannot enter the back side of your own mind.

The front side of your mind is very limited; action has to be limited. Inaction is enormous; it has no limits, it is vast. Action can be defined, reduced to explanations, to theories. But the beauty, the experience of the inactive, stays with you, is beyond words. But it is there whether you know it or not, it does not depend on your knowing, it is always there. I will come to it later on when I am answering your question exactly. Just now I am creating the space in which the question can be answered.

The second split is between the right side and the left side. Our hands are representative of the right and the left sides,

but in a strange way: the left hand represents the right side of the mind, and the right hand represents the left side of the mind. And because we have used only the right hand and the left hand is very secondary, somewhere deep in our minds the right is right and the left is wrong.

So anything that is wrong we condemn as leftist, and anything that we want to appreciate -- the tradition supports it, the orthodoxy is behind it, the masses are absolutely for it -- is rightist.

In India the wife cannot sit at the right side of the man, she has to sit at the left side. She is a condemned being. At the most she can be the left hand, but never the right hand -- that is preserved for the man.

But strangely we were not aware for centuries that the right hand represents the left side of mind; it is joined criss-cross. So the left side of the mind has developed because the right hand is active. Its action is an extension of the side of the mind it is connected to. And because the left hand is ignored, the right side of the mind has also been ignored.

So there is a cross in the mind of man, dividing it in two ways. Front and back, that is one division; then right and left -- another division. If the cross can have any significance, this should be the significance.

Every man is on the cross, not only Jesus Christ.

And the cross is not outside you, the cross is within you. It is far heavier than the outside cross, and it is far more murderous. It has destroyed so enormously, so devastatingly, that it is almost incalculable. And all the traditions of the world have been supporting it.

The left side of the mind has its qualities.... For example, it can be used by the front of the mind without any difficulty.

It has a certain affinity with the front of the mind. The right side of the mind has a certain affinity with the back side of the mind. So as the meditator moves into the unused parts of his own mind... if he moves to the back part he becomes absolutely silent.

Many mystics have never spoken, for the simple reason that they had no idea... that if they wanted to speak, they had to move to the right side of the mind, they had to use the right side of the mind.

Before they ever entered into meditation they had used the left side of the mind -- they knew only it. When they moved into meditation suddenly they found that there is no connection between the left side of the mind and the back of the mind. They became disconnected. Their silence was not willed; simply, they could not find a way out of it. They tried the left side of the mind, to which they were accustomed, and they could not reach it. From the back of the mind there is no way to the left side of the mind. They never said a single word.

Very few mystics have done the tremendous job of searching and seeing the fact that the left side of the mind is used by the front mind for thinking and for all kinds of activities. It is a natural deduction that perhaps the right side of the mind may be the way to express silence, to let it become a song. These are the few mystics who became known as great masters.

All mystics have not been masters. They had realized, they had come to the ultimate peak of experience, but they remained isolated and cut off from the larger humanity. They could not contribute anything. They knew it -- but suddenly they found they were dumb. They have tasted it,

but by tasting it they have lost their tongue, they cannot speak about it.

One of the greatest philosophers of the contemporary West, Ludwig Wittgenstein, has made one of the most pregnant statements. He is the only man in the contemporary world who writes only maxims, who does not even make a paragraph -- just lines, each line separate and individual. One of his lines is: "That which cannot be said should not be said." Now, this man is aware that there is something which cannot be said. He is not denying it, he is not saying that there is nothing mysterious; it is there. But he is making a statement that that which cannot be said, should not be said. Why? Because whatever you say is going to be wrong. That is the situation of a person who has somehow come in contact with the back of the mind.

Now, this man was a trained philosopher, and trained under the greatest minds of this age. He had fortunately, Bertrand Russell as one of his teachers, G.E. Moore as one of his teachers -- and both these great philosophers, G.E. Moore and Bertrand Russell, have said about him, "Although he was a student, we felt like pygmies before him." And these were the great philosophers, Nobel Prize winners.

What was it about Ludwig Wittgenstein that made them feel like pygmies? -- he was just a student and it was at the suggestion of Bertrand Russell that Wittgenstein published his notes that he was taking in Russell's class. They were not notes of what Russell was saying, they were notes of what Wittgenstein's reactions were to Bertrand Russell's statements.

When Russell looked at Wittgenstein's copy book he said, "My God, I thought you were writing about my speeches,

my lectures. But you have written original things, you have done a great job." He was reacting.... Bertrand Russell had a developed front part of his mind, and that man Ludwig Wittgenstein was in contact with the back of his mind. Scientists say we don't know what the purpose of the back of the mind is. They have not been able to figure it out, why it is there, because it is half of the mind but it seems to have no purpose. It helps in no way, it has no function. Scientists perhaps will never be able to understand this abysmal depth, darkness, and the mysterious part of their own minds.

Whatever Wittgenstein had noted down as reactions in his notebooks, Bertrand Russell persuaded him to publish. Wittgenstein said, "but these are simply notes! You were talking, and when I heard something and I felt it was not the right thing, I simply wrote down notes, just for my own purposes."

Bertrand Russell insisted, "the notes should be published as they are; and don't edit them, because they bring something which is not known to the thinker, the philosopher; they bring something which is known only to the mystic. It is just a coincidence that a mystic has come to study philosophy."

But Wittgenstein could not find the connection between the mysterious side of his mind and the left side of his mind. There was no bridge. He tried hard -- he was a trained philosopher, logician, so naturally he worked very hard. He wrote his books again and again, revised them, tried hard, and finally decided that that which cannot be said, should not be said, because whatever you say is going to be wrong. It will not represent the actual experience.

He could not find the real passage from the back of the mind. It is not the left side of the mind. The left side of the mind is in the service of the front of the mind, it is part of the world of activities. The right side of the mind is in the service of the inactive, of the silent, of the unmoving. We are carrying this cross continuously. Aristotle's logic fits with the left side of the mind and the front of the mind, but it leaves great spaces outside. The front of the mind and the left side of the mind are very small. The back of the mind is just endless; it is an opening into the mysteries of life.
Once in a while it has happened that somebody has found the link and has been able to say something significant. That's why there are so many mystics in the world but very few masters. A master is a mystic who has found that the right side of the mind is the way to convey the illogical, the mysterious, the unexplained and the unexplainable.
Your question is: What happens to people sometimes? -- People who are not even acquainted with me, who may have come just out of curiosity to see me, who may just have happened to be there accidentally when I was passing by.... But something transpires, they are aflame. You can see from their eyes, from their faces: within a second they have moved miles. And they were not expecting it, they were not desiring it. They were not even aware of it, that this was going to happen. They become aware of it only when it has happened, and there is no way to undo it.
It happens because of a few things. First, because they were not expecting it, so there was no barrier. They were not there desiring something, so there was no barrier. They were not in any kind of relationship with me, so they were simply present, with no hindrance, with no expectations.

Just being there is one of the most significant things, and a person who loves me will find it difficult to just be there. Some unconscious desire, expectation... just a very small expectation that I should recognize him -- that is enough. But the stranger, the tourist, the curious, the accidental has no expectation, even this much. He just happens to be standing there, and I pass by. And because there is no barrier, the mysterious part of his being is available... not that I have to do something, it is just that he is available. And as the flame can jump from one candle to another candle -- you just have to bring them close enough....

He is there, silently waiting, without expectation: that brings him closer. The bigger the expectation, the bigger the distance. And from my mysterious world just a small flame has to take a jump. All that is needed is a certain closeness so that you catch it.

Once it has happened, perhaps he may come tomorrow again, but it is not going to happen, because the next day he will come with the expectation -- the same man. In fact ordinary logic will say that now it has happened to him, there is more possibility of it happening. But life does not follow the ordinary logic. It has its own way, which is very illogical. At least it is certain it does not follow Aristotle's divided logic, it does not follow our mind's divided approach to reality.

Mind sees things in black and white, nothing in between: day and night -- nothing in between; life and death -- nothing in between; love and hate -- nothing in between. Mind simply divides, splits, cuts a thing into two separate polar realities, makes them so contradictory that it seems

impossible that there could be a way for them not to be separate, for them to be one reality.

The mind has only taken the two ends of one reality. That's how it is. Logically, love and hate are opposites, contradictory. But existentially, that's not true. Love can move easily into hate without any barrier. Hate can move into love just like waves moving into other waves with no barriers anywhere.

It is our idea that light and dark are two contradictory realities. That's not true. There are animals who see in the night, and in the day they cannot see. The light is too much for their delicate eyes; it blinds them. In daylight they see only darkness because their eyes are closed and they cannot open them. They can open their eyes only when the calmness and the quiet and the peaceful night descends. Then they can open their delicate eyes, and the night is all full of light. They have more sensitive eyes than us. Our night is their day; our day is their night.

There is no opposition. At the most we can say that light is less dark, and darkness is less light. But we have to use something which makes only a difference of degrees and does not create any contradiction.

And every day we see life moving into death so calmly, so quietly, without making any fuss. You cannot hear even the footsteps of death. There cannot be any contradiction. And those who know, know the other side also -- that death goes on moving into new forms of life. All distinctions are man-made -- existence is distinctionless.

Once we start thinking of one reality, distinctionless -- not dividing into dualities or dichotomies -- the cross can disappear from the mind. Nobody else has crucified you --

you yourself are responsible, because you can put the cross away from you, and your whole mind can become one.
In the oneness of your mind you have tremendous powers. Not that you become powerful over other people, but suddenly you find things are happening through you, not by you. You have become a vehicle of a vast existence; and this is what creates such kinds of happenings.
You can see it: a stranger is standing close by, and suddenly becomes afire. He will never be the same man again because he cannot forget what for a moment had become reality. It will haunt him, it will follow him like a shadow. He will have to do something; otherwise he will be haunted by the memory of it. What has happened is that the back of his mind, which may have remained dormant for millennia, has suddenly become alive.
This is what I call synchronicity. And this is the only symbol of whether you are with a master or not.
People have wondered down the ages, "What are the qualities of a master? How to define the master? How to decide who is the right master? Who is just pretending to be a master and who is really and authentically a master?" They have come to many definitions and many qualities and many attributes -- and they are all of the logical mind. None of them is of any significance.
I would like to tell you that only one thing decides a true master, and that is that his presence can make your dormant mind suddenly alive; it can put you on fire.
It can make you blossom into thousands of flowers in just a single moment. The moment becomes so intense that it is almost equal to eternity. This is the only way to decide- everything else is meaningless.

Each religion has its own definitions of a true master. They all differ in their definitions -- obviously -- because they have found those definitions by following a certain teacher, who may have been a master or may not have been a master. They have simply collected all his attributes -- what he eats, what he wears, how he walks, how he sits, how much he sleeps....

But each master is unique, so you cannot define him by these things. Mahavira is naked, Buddha is his contemporary, and he is not naked. Now, Jainas cannot accept Buddha as an authentic master for the simple reason that he is not naked: a true master has to be naked. Buddhists cannot accept Mahavira as a master for the simple reason that Buddha's whole teaching is to remain always in the middle; all extremism is egoistic, the extremist is always an egoist.

Now, there are people who go on collecting all kinds of things -- this is one extreme. And there is another extreme: there are people who, as far as possible, go on renouncing everything. If it were possible for them to take off their skin, they would take off their skin too. They have to stop at the clothes because more than that is impossible to do, they have come to the end.

So according to the Buddhist, Mahavira is an extremist. There is no need to be naked. Perhaps when it is too hot you can be naked; but when it is too cold you need a blanket -- and there is no harm in it, you have to take care of the body. You just remain in the middle, you don't go to the extremes. You don't start collecting blankets; nor should you remain naked in the cold, unnecessarily torturing yourself.

The Buddhists cannot accept Mahavira as a master because their definitions are from the outside. They are just watching a man from the outside, they don't know the inner reality of the master. There is only one thing that defines -- everything else is casual, an individual choice.

Mahavira, as far as I understand, was such a beautiful man -- perhaps in the whole history of men there has never been such a proportionate body with such an exquisite beauty. I don't accept the Jainas' idea that he is an ascetic, that's why he is naked. No. My own understanding is that he loves beauty, and he is so beautiful that any clothing on him will simply destroy his beauty. Naked, he is just pure beauty.

In fact, clothes have been discovered by people to cover their bodies so they don't show their unproportionate bodies. Clothes have other purposes too, but the basic purpose is not only the climate; the basic purpose seems to be to keep your body looking as beautiful as possible. Naked, it is not so beautiful; naked only very few people will be beautiful -- most of them will look ugly. With clothes most of them look beautiful because only the face shows.

I don't think Mahavira is an extremist. I simply conceive that the man is so beautiful he does not need clothes; and he is so healthy that the changing seasons make no difference to him. It is because of his health and his beauty. But that does not decide anything as to his being a master or not. For that, there is one, and only one, criterion: whether he puts people on fire -- particularly those who are strangers, particularly those who have come only as curiosity-seekers, just to see what kind of man this is who attracts so many people.

They have not come with a spiritual desire because desire as such is always unspiritual.
So there cannot be any spiritual desire. They have not come to gain anything, they are just onlookers. And this is the criterion: if the master passes by such people and something transpires in those people -- who are not ready in any way, who have not prepared for it, who have not even dreamed about it, who are as much surprised as anyone else seeing them....
In fact they feel a little embarrassed because this was not their idea: they had come just out of curiosity to see the man. And now something has happened in them, something which is so unique, and so valuable.... A gift that they had not asked for suddenly has been thrown into their hands. And this is a difficult phenomenon, because then they would like to come again and again, but now there is desire, now there is expectation; now they are not coming in the same innocent way as they had come for the first time. And now it will not be happening.
Let me remind you of the divisions of the mind. The first time they were there, they were simply interested to see the man. Seeing the man, for a moment their thinking stops. For a moment they are engulfed by the energy the man carries around him; unknowingly they are pulled into something for which they are not ready. Something in them has changed, and changed forever, and will not leave them at rest.
But they should understand the simple process; otherwise they will get into the very troubled journey millions of people are in. And then they will be angry at the master: "Why is he not doing the same thing to me again?"

He had never done anything, he had simply passed by your side. He is passing every day by your side -- only the first time you were clean, you were open; you had no hindrance, you had simply allowed him to come in. But now you are tight, tense, you are demanding; you want it to be happening again and again, more and more. Now you have got into a vicious circle: the more you demand, the more you expect, the less is the possibility.

All demands come from the front of the mind, all desires come from the front of the mind, all expectations are in the front of the mind. The back of the mind is absolutely innocent, that of a child.

So you have to understand your first experience; how it has happened, where you were, what your space was. That is more significant. So if you can keep your space intact and don't fill it with expectations and desires and demands; remembering that the master never does anything... it is beyond doing, because all doing is of the front of the mind. All action is of the front of the mind, and the master lives at the back of the mind, the dark side of the mind, the mysterious side of the mind, the illogical side of the mind. If you come to him with the front part of your mind, then there is an unbridgeable gap between you and the master. You have to come to the master without the front part of your mind, allowing him the availability, the receptivity of the back part of your mind.

Neither the master does anything nor are you expected to do anything. It is simply a happening.

That's why I call it synchronicity.

It is just that the master is full of it, and you are silent and available: That fullness is going to fill you. But you have to

be empty. All that is needed of you is that you have to be empty.

And remember, I repeat again: the master cannot do anything. Yes, much happens in his presence -- he is a catalytic agent. It can happen while he is speaking, it can happen while he is silent, it can happen in any moment. All that is needed is your availability.

In my own life's experience this has been a continuous problem. The people who have felt something changing in them have remained with me -- but with a desire. Then they are angry because it seems as if I have forgotten them, as if I am no longer working on them, as if I am no longer interested in them. No, I am the same. Neither my interest can do it nor can any action on my part do it.

How it happens is something that you have to understand. It is not a question of being virtuous, it is not a question of being very scholarly. It demands nothing.

It simply happens to those who can be in the presence of the master simply, innocently, who can just enjoy the presence itself -- whether anything happens or not is irrelevant, then it will come with more and more force. It will become a tidal wave, and it will be coming more and more often. And soon it will start coming even at a distance from the master.

You may be thousands of miles away, but you just have to be in the right posture -- I mean the inner posture -- and it starts happening... because the presence was only a triggering of something which is already yours. Just the presence made it clear to you that it is there within you. And once you become certain that it is within you, then wherever you are, just getting into the right inner posture....

See how things go wrong with man. It is the inner posture that is required -- and people are practicing yoga postures around the world, which have nothing to do with it. It is not how you are sitting, whether in a lotus posture.... It does not matter, it is something within you.

So just always remember your first experience because that is the most significant experience, and it gives you the whole secret. And the secret is that you were completely innocent. And once you know that, you can be anywhere, just in the same posture, and it will come and you will be afire, aflame.

The distance makes no difference.

Even if the master is dead, that makes no difference because the reality is within you; the master was only a triggering point.

Now it is up to you not to misunderstand, and to be clear how it happened, and to just go on being in the same position.

Looking at the sunrise or sitting by the side of a tree, watching the stars, just get into the same posture, and you will find your master is everywhere.

The people who started worshipping the sun, the moon, the stars, the trees, were not idiots. Because they found that the whole existence provides you with your master in different forms. And the whole thing depends on you.

It happens even with those who are not masters but mystics only. But the difficulty with mystics is, it may happen to you but they cannot explain to you the how and why of it. And because they cannot explain it to you, you are going to remain in the wrong posture you whole life.

The master's function is to give you the experience, and then to explain to you that you are responsible for it, that you are the source of it, that the master was only a certain situation, a certain device that triggered your dormant mind, moved it, made it alive.
Now it is for you to get deeper and deeper into the same posture of synchronicity with the master and then with this whole beautiful existence, with anything.
And unless the whole existence becomes your master, your master has failed.
So don't let me down!

Light on the Path

Chapter #12

Chapter title: Religiousness is interwoven into existence itself

11 January 1986 pm in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1

BELOVED OSHO,

I WAS SITTING IN HOLLAND, AND THROUGH EVERYTHING THAT HAPPENED AROUND YOU, I GOT REALLY WORRIED, SO I JUST DECIDED TO COME. I WANTED TO SEE YOU, I JUST WANTED TO SEE WHETHER YOU ARE OKAY. I WAS SO MAD WHEN I SAW WHAT HAPPENED TO YOU, I GOT SO ANGRY.

I HAVE A QUESTION -- I JUST MADE IT UP. WHAT I SEE HAPPENING IN EUROPE FOR THE LAST

MONTHS, IS THE ATTITUDE THAT RELIGION IS DEAD AND LEADERS ARE "OUT." YOU HAVE SHOWN ME THE MEANING OF RELIGION, AND I CONSIDER MYSELF A LEADER, SO I DECIDED TO CALL MYSELF A RELIGIOUS LEADER. EVERYBODY FREAKED OUT, SAYING, "YOU ARE NUTS -- THAT IS NOT THE THING TO DO TODAY." I SAID, "THAT'S WHY I'M DOING IT!"
OSHO, WHAT DO YOU THINK?

The question is very significant. There is a prophetic saying of Nietzsche's: "God is dead and man is free." He had tremendous insight into the matter. Very few people have been able to understand it, the depth of his statement. It is a milestone in the history of consciousness.
If there is a God, man can never be free -- that is an impossibility. God and man's freedom cannot co-exist, because the very meaning of God is that he is the creator; then we are reduced to puppets. And if he can create us, he can destroy us at any moment. He never asked us when he created us -- he is not obliged to ask us when he wants to destroy us. It is purely his whim to create or to destroy. How can you be free? You are not free even to be. Even your birth is not your freedom, nor is your death your freedom -- and between these two slaveries do you think your life can be freedom?
God has to die if man's freedom is to be saved.
The choice is clear; there is no question of any compromise. With God man will remain a slave and freedom will remain just an empty word. Only without God does freedom start having meaning.

But Friedrich Nietzsche's statement is only half; nobody has tried to make it complete. It looks complete, but appearances are not always true. Friedrich Nietzsche was not aware that there are religions in the world which have no God -- yet even in those religions man is not free. He was not aware of Buddhism, Jainism, Taoism -- the most profound religions of all. For all these three religions there is no God.

For the same reason Lao Tzu, Mahavira and Gautam Buddha have denied God -- because they could see that with God, man is just a puppet. Then all efforts for enlightenment are meaningless; you are not free, how can you become enlightened? And there is somebody omnipotent, all-powerful -- he can take away your enlightenment. He can destroy anything!

But Nietzsche was not aware that there have been religions which are godless. For thousands of years there have been people who have understood that God's existence is the greatest barrier to man's freedom -- they removed God. But still man is not free.

What I am trying to lead you to understand is that just by making God dead you cannot make man free. You will have to make one more thing dead -- and that is religion. That's why I said religion also has to die; it has to follow God. And we have to create a religiousness which is godless and religionless, which has nobody above more powerful than you, and no organized religion to create different kinds of cages -- Christian, Mohammedan, Hindu, Buddhist. Beautiful cages...

With God and religion both dead, one more thing dies automatically -- and that is the priesthood, the leader, the

different forms of religious leader. Now he has no function. There is no organized religion in which he can be a pope or a shankaracharya or Ayatollah Khomeini. He has no God whom he can represent; his function is finished.

Buddha, Mahavir, Lao Tzu dropped God in the same way as Friedrich Nietzsche -- not knowing, not aware that if religion remained even without God, the priest would manage to keep man in slavery. And he has kept man in slavery.

So to complete the insight of Friedrich Nietzsche, religion has to die. There is no point of an organized religion if there is no God. For whom does the organized religion exist? The churches, the temples, the mosques, the synagogues have to disappear. And with that the rabbis and the bishops and all kinds of religious leaders become simply jobless, they become futile. But a tremendous revolution happens: man becomes utterly free.

Before I can tell you the implications of this freedom you have to understand: if Friedrich Nietzsche's insight is complete, then what kind of freedom will be available to man? God is dead, man is free... free for what? His freedom will be just like any other animal's.

It is not right to call it freedom -- it is licentiousness. It is not freedom because it does not carry any responsibility, any consciousness. It will not help man to raise himself upwards, to become something higher than he is in his slavery. Unless freedom takes you higher than what you were in your slavery, it is meaningless.

It is possible your freedom may take you lower than your slavery, because the slavery had a certain discipline, it had a certain morality, it had certain principles. It had a certain

organized religion to look after you, to keep you afraid of punishment and hell, to keep you greedy for rewards and heaven, and to keep you a little above the wild animal -- who has freedom but that freedom has not made him a higher being. It has not given him any quality that you can appreciate.

And because Nietzsche has no idea that just to give freedom is not enough... is not only not enough, it is dangerous. It may reduce man to animality. In the name of freedom he may lose his path towards higher states of consciousness.

When I say that God is dead, religion as an organized body is dead -- man is free to be himself. For the first time he is free to explore his innermost being with no hindrances. He is free to dive into the depths of his being, rise to the heights of his consciousness. There is nobody to hinder him, his freedom is total.

But this freedom is possible only if -- with God going out of existence, religion going out of existence, priesthood, religious leadership going out of existence -- we can save something that I call the quality of religiousness, so only religiousness is alive... and it is perfectly harmonious with human freedom; it enhances human growth.

And by "religiousness" I mean that man, as he is, is not enough; he can be more, he can be enormously more. Whatever he is, is only a seed. He does not know what potential he is carrying within himself.

Religiousness simply means a challenge to grow, a challenge for the seed to come to its ultimate peak of expression, to burst forth in thousands of flowers and release the fragrance that was hidden in it. That fragrance I

call religiousness. It has nothing to do with your so-called religions, it has nothing to do with God, it has nothing to do with priesthood: it has something to do with you and your possibilities of growth.
So I have removed all the barriers. And I can understand your problem. I have made you religious, I have made you a religious leader, and naturally, suddenly I have taken everything away from you.
The situation is such... I found you crying and weeping, in misery, in anguish, and it was not the time to talk about religiousness. You needed a few toys to play with -- I gave you the toys. You enjoyed the toys; you stopped crying, you forgot your misery, you were happy, you were singing and dancing. But the problem is that that is not the end of your potential, and I was so much concerned that you may get stuck in this superficial happiness, joy...
I had to take away those toys -- you may get too identified with them, you may cling to them because they gave you a moment of joy. Those toys have taken your tears away, you have forgotten your worries and your anguish. Those toys have proved something like opium. Before you get too addicted to those toys, a real master has to take them away. Only a false master can be happy with your happiness, because you will be grateful to him -- although you are living in an illusion. Toys cannot give you the authentic, the real. The original face cannot be revealed by them. Yes, they can keep you engaged, occupied, so that you can forget yourself. But the real question is not to forget yourself but to remember.
Now those toys are a hindrance. They did their work, they have taken away your tears. They did their work, they have

given you a consolation; at least you are now in a position where something of the higher can be talked about. Those toys have to be taken away quickly. Given time, you will start carrying those toys with you twenty-four hours a day, just like little children with their teddy-bears; they cannot sleep without them, they cannot go anywhere without them. They have become almost part of their being.

Naturally, you will be in an embarrassing situation -- because I gave you religion, I gave you a certain leadership. You created around you a following. You created, converted, convinced people of the truth of the new religion. And the more people were convinced by you, the more you were convinced that certainly you are a great leader.

And then suddenly, in the middle of a sweet dream, I wake you up and tell you that it is all nonsense: there is no religion, there is no leadership, there is no possibility of any organized truth, and there is no way that somebody can represent it.

It is very shattering. It takes away the earth, and you find yourself hanging in a limbo. But I want you to allow this situation to penetrate you as deeply as possible so that you can be free, and you can also make those people who have come under your influence free.

It is very easy to influence somebody, to convert somebody, to create a following; it is very difficult to unconvince him -- to say that you are no longer a leader, in fact you have never been a leader; that there is no religion, that you were talking in your dreams.

It needs guts to say to people, "I am not your savior," to say to people, "I am not your leader; I am a seeker, just the way

you are a seeker. At the most we can be fellow travelers, we can be friends, but that ugly relationship of the leader and the follower does not exist anymore.

"We can love each other; there is no need of any agreement, there is no fear about disagreement. You have to be yourself. Certainly there will be things you will not agree about, and there will be things I will not agree with you about." That's what makes individuals and gives them uniqueness -- and that's one of the most beautiful experiences, to see in somebody a unique individual.

They will be shocked. Those who have become convinced, those who started looking up to you for guidance, for growth -- they will be shocked. But that shock is necessary. It is necessary because unless the child's cord that joins him with the mother is cut... and it is a shock, the greatest shock.

You will not come across such a shock in your whole life, because the child has been living through the mother, he has been feeding, breathing through the mother. For nine months he has been simply a part of the mother, and suddenly you disconnect him; you disconnect that helpless child from the source of his life. To the child the shock is almost like death. You are trying to give him an individuality; you are giving him his own being, his own life.

The womb may be cozy, the womb may be comfortable -- it is very comfortable. The scientists say we have not yet been able to create any kind of situation which is so cozy, so comfortable as the mother's womb. The child has not to worry about food, about tomorrow. The child simply lives unworried, unconcerned with any problem. He knows no

problem for nine months, and then suddenly all the problems... he is no longer connected with the source of his life. But these problems have to be faced. These problems will give him a backbone. The earlier he accepts the challenge, the better.

Exactly the same happens when somebody follows you. He becomes dependent for all insight, for all guidance. He need not think about it: you know it, the leader knows it, the priest knows it. He has simply to ask -- he need not bother to find the answer himself.

You had taken away his worries, and now you are giving him all the worries back again, all the problems, all the challenges. You are not only giving him all the worries that you had taken away from him, you are multiplying them by saying there is no God. At least before he had met you there was a God; he could have prayed!

I was in jail in America. In one of the cells in one of the jails, I was sharing with an old man -- very nice, but each morning he would kneel down, put his head on the bed and pray to God. The whole day he was looking at THE BIBLE; then before going to sleep again the same ritual, he would kneel down. He was a little puzzled that I was not doing anything like that. The next day he asked me, "Are you not a Christian?"

I said, "I am available if you can convert me to Christianity. Only one thing I can say to you, that I am available to everybody. Just try to convert me."

He was very happy -- a great chance to convert a man to Christianity. He started talking about God, and I started asking him questions which of course he was not even able

to answer. He read passages from THE BIBLE and I told him, "This is all nonsense!"

By the evening he said, "Forgive me, I have not been able to convert you -- but you have disturbed me completely. The whole day I have been trying again and again. Whenever you have been out for your lunch or your supper I tried my prayer: it does not work, because even I am suspicious myself that what I am doing may be stupid -- kneeling down and putting my head on the bed and trying to talk to a God who does not exist.

"But you have disturbed me very much. I have been in jail for seven years and God has helped me immensely. But you say there is no God, so perhaps it was just my imagination. I was thinking it was God who is taking care of me, that it is only a test -- this jail, for ten years -- and that he is always there and I need not be worried. Seven years have passed, another three years will also pass, and I have not complained a single time. I was very proud that I trusted him. If he has put me in such a situation then there must be some meaning in it. It is God's act -- it cannot be meaningless.

"But if there is no God... and I cannot answer your questions. I had never doubted, but you have created doubt in me. You will be gone in a day or two -- how am I going to pass the coming three years? I will look in THE BIBLE and I will find doubts. I will try to pray and I will know that I am doing just a stupid thing: there is nobody here. I am just doing the whole thing on my own, creating a hallucination."

He came close to me, took my hands in his hands and asked me, "Just please put me back -- whatever it is, right or

wrong, just put me back into my illusions. Don't leave me in this situation; otherwise these three years will be too much to bear."
So when you tell people, you will not only be simply returning their worries. You will be giving them a multiplied form of their worries, because meanwhile you have taken away many of their consolations, their beliefs, their illusions. They will be angry; they will be very much disappointed.
It is easy to convert somebody to a system of belief; it is very difficult to convince somebody to be free of all beliefs, because you are destroying all possibilities of creating hallucinations.
But this is the function of the authentic man.
I gave you toys -- I have broken them. And you have to understand the significance of why I have broken them... because I feel that now my people are mature enough that they can live without God, that they don't need any teddy-bear; that they can live without any organized religion, that they can live on their own, alone.
With this tremendous trust in you, I have taken your toys away, knowing that it will hurt for a moment. But you have come of age, and I am not going to be here forever: before I leave I have to take away all the illusions that I have given to you, because I don't want to be responsible before existence.

Question 2
BELOVED OSHO,
I DON'T WANT YOU TO BE WORRIED ABOUT ME. I HAVEN'T GONE NUTS ORGANIZING RELIGIONS,

DON'T BE WORRIED THAT I AM DOING THAT -- I AM NOT THAT SERIOUS ABOUT IT. I THOUGHT YOU WOULD HAVE A GOOD LAUGH!
YOU THINK THAT I HAVE GONE NUTS OUT THERE -- NO, I WAS JUST TRYING TO TELL YOU, "HEY, OSHO, I'M IN YOUR CORNER." I'M NOT TELLING PEOPLE TO JOIN MY TEAM. NO, DON'T WORRY ABOUT THAT.
NO, I'M SITTING HERE SAYING, "OH, MAN! HE THINKS I'VE GONE CRAZY!" NO, NO, NO, NO -- I WAS JUST ADDING A QUESTION. I THOUGHT SHE [INDICATING SAMADHI] WAS GOING TO DO THE INTERVIEW, AND I THOUGHT, "HERE IS A LAUGH FOR THE END: `OSHO, I AM A RELIGIOUS LEADER!'"

I know that, but I'm not only answering you. Through you I'm answering so many people around the world: you are just an excuse!
So I know you, that's... Don't be worried about it. But there are people who will be really shocked. They were enjoying their leadership, they were enjoying following people who had become convinced. Now I have simply destroyed the whole structure. They will all be angry with me. Rather than being grateful to me they will be angry at me.
Only those who are mature enough will feel the gratitude that I am leaving you absolutely free, that I am giving you the taste of what it means to be free. And yet that freedom is not going to drag you downwards; that freedom is going to take you upwards.

So I have kept the word "religiousness" just to remind you that God can die, religions can disappear, but religiousness is something interwoven into existence itself.
It is the beauty of the sunrise, it is the beauty of a bird on the wing. It is the beauty of an opening lotus. It is all that is truthful, all that is sincere and authentic, all that is loving and compassionate. It includes everything that pulls you upwards, that does not make you stop at where you are, but always keeps reminding you that you have yet far to go. Every place that you stop for a rest is only a rest for the night; in the morning we go again on the pilgrimage. It is an eternal pilgrimage, and you are alone -- and you are totally free.
So it is a great responsibility -- which is not possible for a man who believes in God, which is not possible for a man who believes in the priest, who believes in the church, because he is giving his responsibility to other people. The Christian thinks Jesus is the savior, so it is his responsibility: "He should come and deliver us from our misery, from this hell."
Freedom simply makes you absolutely responsible for everything that you are and that you are going to be.
Hence I have kept the word "religiousness." It is beautiful. It is not organization; it is not Hindu, Mohammedan, Christian. It is simply a fragrance just to keep you going. There is nowhere to stop.
In life there is no full stop, not even a semi-colon -- just small commas. Just for a while you can rest, but the rest is just to gather energy to go forward, to go upward.
I know your question has nothing to do with you; nor has my answer anything to do with you. But it is a significant

question and it has to do with thousands of people around the world. They need clarity about it, what is happening: From this, where do we go?
Samadhi, do you have a question?

Question 3
BELOVED OSHO,
I JUST THANK YOU SO MUCH!

I know!

Question 4
BELOVED OSHO,
I HAVE BEEN CRYING VERY MUCH. I THOUGHT I WAS CRYING ABOUT YOU -- I THINK NOT. ALL THE TIME I FELT SAD AND SO EMBARRASSED FOR YOU, AND I NEVER WANT IT TO HAPPEN AGAIN!
I SEE A LOT OF PEOPLE... I KNOW THAT LOTS OF PEOPLE LOVE YOU SO MUCH. THEY CANNOT TAKE THE STORIES OF SHEELA, THE COMMUNE, BUT WHENEVER THEY READ YOUR WORDS OR THEY READ A BOOK OR THEY HEAR A THING, THEY FEEL YOU.
AND I JUST WONDER: HOW WILL IT BE POSSIBLE FOR PEOPLE STILL TO HAVE YOU AVAILABLE? THERE ARE NO BIG CENTERS ANYMORE. HOW WILL IT BE POSSIBLE?
IS THERE ANYTHING THAT CAN BE DONE?

Now it will be easier. Now I will be more available to individuals, and they will be able to be in direct contact with me more easily.

And the communes will come together again, but on a higher level, on a higher plane. The centers will come to function again. It is good for the time being just to have a discontinuity, so everything that comes has not even a shadow of the past over it.

I don't want very organized communes, for the simple reason that whenever you become very organized you start losing something for which you had started to organize in the first place. Other things become more important.

For example, in Poona there was a totally different quality. People were coming from all over the world. They had small centers. There was no centralized domination over the centers; all the centers were free to do whatsoever they wanted to do. To me it was far more beautiful.

People were working six, nine months; then for three months they were with me. And then those three months were just of pure joy because there was no need to work, there was no need to be concerned with all kinds of unnecessary problems. They were enjoying meditations. If they wanted, they were doing therapy groups. If they simply wanted to be there to listen to me, they were there. Those three months or six months, or whatsoever they could manage, were sheer joy.

In America the whole fabric changed. People had no time even to meditate. Out of sheer necessity they had to built the houses, they had to make the roads, they had to make the reservoir; otherwise how could they live? For five thousand people they had to make all the living facilities.

Sooner or later that kind of commune was going to break down, for the simple reason that people were engaged twelve to fourteen hours per day. They had never thought about it; they had come to the commune with the idea of Poona -- that it would be a relaxation, it would be a meditation, it would be a growth facility, and their whole time would be for their spiritual growth. They could play music, they could be creative on their own.

But what they found there was that out of sheer necessity they were building houses, they were making roads, they were making reservoirs; they were fighting hundreds of cases against the government, against the neighbors. Their whole energy... as if they had forgotten for what they had come. There was no time to meditate, no time to dance, no time to sing your songs or play on your flute. They were just hoping that soon, when the commune was complete, they would be able...

But I knew that this was impossible. First, the commune would never be complete in the sense that new people were joining; you had to make new houses, new roads, new facilities, more food, more clothes, more medical facilities, more schools for children. The commune was growing, people were coming, so you would continuously work for this growth.

Secondly, how long can you exist on donations? So even if you come to a point where you see all the facilities of our commune are complete -- which is not possible! But just hypothetically, if you come to a point where your facilities are complete -- for five thousand, for ten thousand people, you have enough -- then the question will arise that you have to be productive. And productive not in the sense of

creative, but productive in the sense of being commercial; otherwise how are you going to survive?
These five thousand people had given everything that they had to create the facilities. But you cannot just live in a house and move on the road. You need food, you need milk, you need medicine, you need clothes: you will have to produce things. And you are caught in a wheel.
So rather than being meditative, rather than just enjoying, being on a holiday, now you are creating factories, working in the factories, producing things... then trying to sell them, finding a market, marketing them...
I knew that this could not be possible. And if it becomes possible, you will turn out to be just another village. You will lose the basic thing for which you had come; you may completely forget about it.
So the commune was going to break down. But it was a necessary step. Always remember that before you succeed in something you have to pass through many failures; success never comes directly. Each failure brings you closer to it because each failure gives you clarity, insight.
People wanted to live with me their whole lives. I knew that this is an impossible demand, but I don't want to hurt anybody. As far as I can manage I never say no, even if I see that this is not going to work. But my saying no will not be right. Let them try and find it out.
So now we are in a better position because all the communes in Europe are going to break down for the same reasons. Economically they will be in difficulties; legally they will be in difficulties. Soon, when there are difficulties, people start being annoyed, irritated, angry; they start fighting with each other...

It is good there are small centers where people come to meditate, to read. At the weekend they can stay there, be together -- small groups which can manage themselves. There is no need for any production, there is no need to build houses; there is no other need.

And these people have to work in the world. That's why I have given the freedom to wear all colors -- no need to wear the mala if there is any problem -- so that you can mix with society, work, and there is no trouble for you. And if you are working for a year, you can certainly save for three months, two months, to be with me.

And I will find a place -- I am looking for it -- a beautiful place, idyllic, just pure beauty, so that you can enjoy those two months to your heart's content. Then you can go back into the world, and you can radiate the joy and the beauty and the experience. You can contaminate other people...

But the place I am going to find is not going to be a commune where you have to stay for your whole life -- just a skeleton crew to take care of visitors, guests who will be coming to stay and then going away. This way it will be easier -- the unnecessary legal problems, unnecessary financial troubles can be avoided.

The people who have been working as therapists can continue to work, but on an individual basis. You have friends in small centers who know you -- they can arrange a group for you. Rather than having an institution, you become a moving institution where people can arrange a group for seven days. You can be with those people for seven days or whatever; you can be available to them, you can become available to them. You can be my wandering messengers.

And anybody who wants to come to me can always come and be here for the time that they can manage. Neither am I responsible, nor will the place where I will be living be responsible. You are responsible: for however long you can manage, you can be there. And then, you go back to the world.

This will bring more people in direct contact with me, because it was happening that people found it difficult even to make arrangements to come to the festivals. They wanted to, but they had given all their money to the commune.

In Germany, in Switzerland, or in Holland, they had given their money to the commune -- now they had no money. They wanted to come to the festival in America to be with me, but they didn't have money. And the commune had its own problems. It had four hundred people; everybody wanted to go, but they could not arrange for four hundred people. Whatsoever money they had given had gone into construction and houses and instruments and everything -- and they didn't have money. They were all at a loss.

So there are people who used to come to Poona every year and were not able to come to me in America in four years. Every year they were trying to come -- but how to come? And the communes where they started living necessarily needed money, so they had given all the money to the commune.

And then the commune was not able to send those people. It could send ten people, twenty people at the most per year. That meant if a four-hundred-people commune was there, it would take somebody ten years, twenty years to

reach me. And he was capable of coming every year when he was alone, not living in a commune. So that was absurd. But we had to pass through that phase, and we have passed through it without any damage, because unless I am damaged, nothing is damaged!

So don't be worried about it. Just tell those people to decentralize. Big communes won't function -- decentralize! The small centers, the old way, was far better; people enjoyed it because somebody's house became a center, and the person loved it, that his house was being used for my work. It becomes something integrated, that people come there to meditate -- it is not something impersonal.

The commune becomes impersonal. And the commune is continuously looking for people who can put in more money. That is nothing to condemn the commune for, because the commune's problem is that it is going downhill all the time. People are there, their necessities are there, and prices are rising and you don't know... a person has given everything, now he has cancer. You have to take care of the person, you have to take care of his surgery; a person has AIDS, now what to do with that person? You cannot say, "Simply leave the commune" -- that seems ugly. But you cannot allow him to live there either, because that seems to be dangerous for four or five hundred people.

You have to decide something. That man may have given everything; he has nothing, nowhere to go. And it is ugly that when he is in a difficulty... and not an ordinary difficulty; when he is facing death you are not supporting him, so you feel guilty. But you are in a dilemma: if you keep him in the commune, then too you will feel guilty because you are risking five hundred people's lives. So you

have to choose the lesser evil, but whatever you choose, you will feel guilty. If you leave that man out, you will feel guilty; if you keep him in you will feel guilty. Something has to be done.

It is better to decentralize the communes. There is no need... just individual homes, individual sannyasins who have small farms or some holiday place in the hills can easily manage weekends or a full week. And now all my therapists are free, so they will be moving all around the world. Wherever they are, use them. Because the place I am going to find is going to be totally different. There will not be therapy groups: there will be meditation groups, there will be music groups, there will be sculpture groups, there will be poetry groups. How long are we going to do just therapy?

People have done therapy; now they need something creative to do. They are in a position now to do something creative. There should be painting groups... So it will be a school of a different kind. You learn painting, you learn to play the guitar, you learn some other instrument, you learn dancing. So we will have these kinds of teachers -- dancers, musicians, painters, sculptors, poets -- and that will be sheer joy. It will be up to you to join any, or as many as you like. And there will be meditation groups; these will continue.

And I will be available to you in a totally different format -- in this format, that you can sit by my side and ask questions. Anybody who has a question can ask a question, because now you are mature enough: there is no need to think that you will ask some stupid question. And even if you do, there is no harm because I never remember what

you have asked! I simply answer what I have to answer. Whatever the question, my answer is going to be certainly significant and meaningful to you.

So I would like now that two hundred people will be there at a time. They can sit just by my side and have a more close, more intimate contact. When there are ten thousand or twenty thousand people I cannot see even your faces, you cannot see my face. You are present, but what kind of presence is that?

So my new idea is that there is going to be my residence only, with a facility for two hundred people who can sit around me on the lawn, anywhere. There is no need for any formal setup; informally we can talk. Or if there is no question, we can just sit in silence. Or if somebody wants to dance, he can dance; if somebody wants to play the flute, we can listen to the flute. So it will be more of a communion.

It will be a totally different way.

So go back and tell my people that they should decentralize, so they don't unnecessarily have troubled heads and the burdens of financial difficulties. Every big commune is going to be bankrupt. So go fast! If it is going to be bankrupt, then go bankrupt! But just disperse people, make them free.

And small, intimate groups, small groups... and nobody dominating, no coordinators. You have not to ask somebody whether you can do this or not -- each small center is autonomous.

I am for freedom.

How can I go on allowing you to be dominated, directed, forced? It has been such a painful experience for me.

Because Veeresh did not listen to the international committee that dominated all the communes and centers, because he was behaving individually, his own way -- he was not fitting into a certain pattern -- his institute was to be dissolved, it was not to exist in my name.

And that was happening all the time, that this institute had to be closed, that that commune had to be closed, because they didn't listen, because they didn't follow orders; they went on in their own way. It was becoming such a heartache for me -- every day, continuously.

So I don't want that kind of thing to happen again. You just have total freedom. And I am available always. And my people are all intelligent people -- they can manage to come to me for two, three months per year, and be with me... or whenever they can manage, for however long they can manage.

My feeling is, this will be of deeper significance. And I will not be burdened... because I don't want to hurt anybody, and then it becomes a problem to me.

I will be the last person to say to Veeresh, "Close your institute." And he knows it. But the people in power were continually harassing me; it became a point for them to harass me that Veeresh's institute should be closed. If I didn't listen to them, then they would start being destructive in other ways.

And that's what happened ultimately. Sheela never wanted me to speak again, for the simple reason that if I speak then she is no longer of any importance. If I am in silence then she is the representative, and whatever she says is the holy word. If I am speaking directly, and you can question me

directly, she is simply no longer the image she has created in four years.

She was insisting that I should not speak, and because I started speaking, she started being destructive to the commune. She created it in every possible way... that the commune could not exist if she leaves. She had not even left food for the next day when she left the commune; she had stopped purchasing food and everything for fifteen days and she left exactly when all the food was finished.

I had sent her to India to look for a location in the Himalayas, because I had told her one year before that if this continuous government fight is going to be there... four hundred sannyasins are involved in legal services -- what nonsense! These people had come to meditate here; they had not come to be attorneys and advocates and in paralegal service and this and that. That they could have done anywhere. That's what they have been doing their whole life -- they had come here to get rid of it! Now again, they were in the same rut.

If this was going to be, then it would be better, before something drastic came... because the government was getting more and more illegal; that was an absolute sign that they were getting drastic. Legally, they could not win; legally we were winning the cases. And to win against the government legally was certainly very shameful to the government. What were you doing if you went on losing cases? That means you were harassing these people. The courts were not supporting you, you were being illegal.

I had told her that sooner or later they will take a drastic step to finish the commune at whatever cost. And that's what they did.

So I had sent her one year before to look for a location where I wanted to start this new phase of work. She came here, but because I had not agreed to her idea of keeping silent, forever... That was her idea, so she would remain forever dominant, the high priestess of the religion. She went on saying things which I had not said, and she did not say the things which I had said. She went on doing things, and then later on she asked my permission -- and she had already done it!

Rather than looking for the place, for seven days she remained in Delhi, informing us from there, "Because of Punjab and India's central government, and Indira's assassination" -- that was the time -- "it is very dangerous to move in the Himalayan areas, so I am stuck in Delhi. If you say so I will go, but it is dangerous."

So I said, "You come back. Don't take an unnecessary risk; after a few months you can go again."

When I came back here... She was not aware of the fact that one sannyasin she had asked, who must have been close to her in Poona, meanwhile got married to the daughter of one of my brothers. She asked the sannyasin -- not knowing that he had got married to one of my brother's daughters -- she asked him, "You have an approach to the government" -- he lives in Delhi -- "so try to create something so that Bhagwan cannot re-enter India."

I had sent her to find a place where I could move in case the government becomes absolutely mad -- and that was going to happen. Instead of finding a place, she was trying to create a situation so that I could not enter India.

So the question was with me continuously that if I say "No" to the people who are in power, then they start being

destructive. If I say "Yes" to them, then I go through a deep suffering that they cannot understand. Any one of my sannyasins, anywhere, unnecessarily harassed is a torture to me. So now I don't want anybody to be on top of any sannyasin.
So tell my people they should not be worried: it is just a passing moment -- it will pass. I am trying to find the right place; soon I will have the right place, and they will have more opportunity to come close to me.
And this will be better -- smaller groups all the year round. I am going to drop all the festivals so there is no need for twenty thousand, thirty thousand people together, because then there is no intimacy. So the festival will be every day. And why have only one festival when you can have three hundred and sixty-five!

Light on the Path
Chapter #13
Chapter title: Whenever there is a sannyasin of mine, I am there
13 January 1986 pm in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
WHAT IS A BUDDHAFIELD? JUST LIVING TOGETHER, RUNNING BUSINESSES, DOESN'T SEEM TO BE ENOUGH, IT IS NOT SATISFYING. IT FEELS LIKE SOMETHING DEEPER -- SOMETHING MORE CHALLENGING FOR THE COLLECTIVE AND

THE INDIVIDUAL, IN WHICH BOTH GROW -- IS NEEDED.

A buddhafield is one of the most mysterious phenomena in existence. It simply means whenever someone becomes awakened, his consciousness radiates a certain aura around him. Whoever is receptive, available, can be transformed by the radiating energy from an awakened being. The very presence of the awakened person can hit you so deep that your dormant energy starts awakening.

It has been described as a sleeping serpent being awakened. It was lying coiled, looking almost dead, and when provoked, it uncoils itself. Because of the similarity of the phenomena, in the East the uncoiling energy in the presence of the awakened person is called Kundalini. Kundalini simply means the serpent power.

The buddhafield can become a network. In the hands of a skilled master it need not be confined to a small area; hence I have introduced the communes. It is as if you put a mirror in front of a light. The mirror has no way of producing light, but it can reflect light. A single light surrounded by thousands of mirrors can create a light of immense quantity.

In India there is a temple made completely of small pieces of mirror. When you enter the temple you are suddenly surrounded by yourself from every side, in thousands of ways: from the ceiling, from the floor, from the walls. Each piece represents you in your totality. It is not that the piece of mirror is going to reflect only a certain part of you; it reflects you totally, your whole personality. And those thousands of mirrors all reflect you.

Just take a burning candle inside with you and you will be surprised at the effect: just one candle suddenly becomes thousands of candles, and all the reflections create tremendous light.

The man who had made the temple was one of the richest men in India. He simply loved to make unique things. He loved me very much. I asked him -- he had taken me to the temple to show me -- I asked him, "Do you know the meaning of this temple?"

He said, "Meaning? I have simply created a unique piece of beauty, architecture, and something which has no parallel in the whole world."

I said, "That's true, but there is meaning also in it, and you must know it, because it is very embarrassing that you created the temple and you don't know the meaning of it. The meaning is, this temple represents in a material way the fabric of a buddhafield."

One buddha can create thousands of seekers around him. They are not awakened but they are willing to be awakened. They have not yet reached the goal, but they are very receptive, open, available. In the presence of the master they can at least function as mirrors very easily; then one buddha becomes millions of buddhas.

I had made the communes so that five thousand people could live together and learn to reflect me. Not to imitate me, remember -- these are two totally different things. The mirror never imitates you; the mirror simply reflects you. Now I have dissolved the communes, because now I want the whole world to be my commune.

Wherever there is a sannyasin, he has to be a mirror. And time and space make no difference: If he is available to me,

he is as close to me as you are. And from the farthest corner of the earth he can reflect me.
And now I have millions of sannyasins around the world. I have withdrawn all conditions that can hinder people from becoming sannyasins. These millions of people are going to create a network of energy enveloping the whole earth.
Just one sun rises in the morning, but it is being reflected by all the oceans, all the lakes, all the rivers, all the ponds. Small ponds reflect the same sun as the biggest ocean. Just one sun rises, and millions of places start reflecting it. And it is not only the ocean, lake, river, ponds -- there are other reflections too, which are more subtle.
Even before the sun comes above the horizon, the birds suddenly start singing. They are awakened, something has happened to them, and something tremendously beautiful; otherwise from where will the song arise? And they are so full of life! The flowers open their petals... these are also reflections. There is no obligation on their part; they can remain buds. There is no obligation on the part of the birds; they may decide not to sing, but something irresistible which is beyond their control....
When the sun is rising, something is rising in them too: their life energy, their kundalini. Of course a bird cannot become a buddha, but he can at least sing, dance, fly in the sky just out of sheer joy, open his wings as an indication of freedom, aliveness. He can claim the whole sky as his own.
And all the flowers -- from the smallest grass flower to the biggest lotus -- they suddenly all fall into a symphony. They forget their differences; they forget that there are poor flowers and there are rich flowers, that there is the proletariat and there are the bourgeois; suddenly all classes

disappear. And in their flowering, in their opening, they release whatsoever they have.

They give back to existence as a gift whatever existence has given to them. They don't keep it, they don't hoard it. They give it back a thousandfold, they multiply it, because what was -- apparently -- not in the seed, what was not in the roots, what was not in the tree, in the branches, in the leaves... has suddenly come to blossom in the flower: all the colors, all the fragrance. But they waited long in the dark night for the sun to rise.

The presence of the sun suddenly gets reflected in millions of ways and creates a network of light, life, joy, fullness, overflowing ecstasy. That's what I mean by a buddhafield. One man getting awakened means the sun has risen. It is the declaration that the dark night of the soul is at an end. But it is possible only if there are millions of people spread all over the earth to create a connectedness. With this net of energy we may be able to transform many people who had no idea, who had never dreamed that there is something more than a mundane life.

So you are right -- just working together, creating a commune, creating finances to run it, is not enough. It has nothing to do with the buddhafield. Seeing the fact that in communes you will get entangled in so many unnecessary things, that there is a possibility to forget for what you had gathered there in the first place.... Now I don't want big communes but small groups, more intimate, or individuals doing their ordinary work in the world. That takes only five hours, five days a week, and leaves you immense time and energy to become part of a great, ecstatic experience.

In the commune I found it is difficult, because you are trying to create an alternative society -- which takes too much time, too much energy. People were working for twelve hours, fourteen hours, and had no energy left. Even if the sun rises, the bird has no energy to sing. The sun rises, but the rose has no energy to open its petals and release the fragrance.

And because you are creating an alternative society, the ordinary world is going to be antagonistic to you. You are strangers and you are trying something which their tradition and their experience prohibits. And they are in the majority; they have governments in their hands, they have the law in their hands. So creating takes your time and energy; and then fighting with the society -- which is too big for you -- that also takes your energy.

I was thinking that humanity had progressed since the days of Socrates, but I was wrong. It is still where it was, it has not progressed at all. Civilization has not yet happened, culture is still a dream, and democracy a faraway utopia. So whenever you come in conflict you will see the barbarous, the primitive, the animalistic, coming up to destroy you. And naturally you cannot survive against the vast masses, the blind people.

I am reminded of a story -- not a story but a real fact; it is so strange that it looks like a story. In South America in a hidden valley deep in the mountains, it was found that there lived a small community of people, not more than three hundred -- all blind. It was strange -- what had happened to these people? What calamity had fallen on them?

One man, very adventurous, a scientific enquirer, wanted to know what had happened to these people... because people

were afraid to go into the valley, it was dangerous. If three hundred people are blind, perhaps there is something wrong in the air, something wrong in the water, something wrong in the food -- who knows what is wrong? You may go blind!

But this courageous young man entered the commune and was surprised... he did not become blind. He figured out what was happening: there was a certain fly in the mountains.... Every child was born with eyes, as every child is born everywhere else, but within three, four months -- if the fly bites the child -- he will go blind. Three or four months was too great a time, and the fly was a common fly, all around, everywhere.

So everybody was born with eyes, but nobody ever remembered that once he had eyes because he had lost them so early in life -- when he was two months old, at the most four months old. But that fly's bite was not capable of destroying a young man's eyes. So anybody who had passed at least one year was beyond the reach of the fly; it needed only the very vulnerable child.

The man wanted to help them because he had found the cause; the cause could be destroyed and those common children could be saved. While he was working on the plans of how to destroy the fly, the whole commune of those primitive people used to laugh at the madman. They used to laugh because they could not believe that he had eyes and they didn't. And of course they were three hundred and he was alone and there was no way to prove that he had eyes. Those three hundred people had never heard about eyes -- he was just a poet, a dreamer!

But living with them he fell in love with a girl of the community. He wanted to marry that girl, but the community had a condition: "You will have to drop this illusion that you have eyes. And to make certain, we have our elders who will check you. If they find something that you call eyes, they will destroy them... because you have something which you should not have. No human being has eyes -- something is wrong with you.

"You can marry the girl of our community, but the condition is that you have to become part of our community. You have to become blind. You can choose. Either you have to leave -- leave us alone and don't disturb us. Since you have come it has been a continuous disturbance. You have been corrupting our youth, putting in their minds the idea of eyes -- which we have never heard of from our elders, our forefathers. We have always lived this way. And we don't need eyes. What will we do with eyes? -- we are perfectly happy and content.

"You have disturbed our peace and now you want to get entry into our community. You will have to choose: you will have to lose your so-called eyes if you want to get married, or you forget all about this love affair and leave this valley and never come back again."

The young man thought for the whole night. He really loved the woman, but this was stupid, the condition was simply idiotic, that he had to lose his eyes. In fact he loved the woman because of his eyes. She was so beautiful, and all those three hundred people were not aware of her beauty and they would never be aware of her beauty. It was his eyes that had given the glimpse of the beauty of the woman.

He had seen so many women, but he settled for a blind woman. Although she was blind, she had something indescribable, something otherworldly. But to lose one's eyes to get that woman seems to be a very strange bargain, because in losing your eyes you will be also losing that woman; you will never be able to see her again. Then all women are equal. To a blind man what difference does it make that you have a homely woman or a Cleopatra? It doesn't matter.

No, he could not manage to convince himself to lose his eyes, because his eyes were the source of the experience of the beauty. In the middle of the night he escaped from the valley.

And this is not a story, it is a historical fact.

So when we created communes, I was thinking humanity has progressed, has come a long way from the days of Socrates and Buddha. But I was wrong. They have not moved a single inch! They have changed their masks, they wear better masks than their ancestors, but behind the mask is hidden a barbarous soul -- uncivilized, uncultured.

It is not able to accept the stranger. It is not vast enough to absorb the new, the unknown, the unexperienced. It becomes irritated, it becomes annoyed. It wants to destroy your eyes, because it is blind and your eyes will remind it about its blindness.

Seeing the situation, I have dissolved the communes. I would rather rely on individuals. In that way I can spread my message far and wide. I have even allowed you, if you feel it difficult, not to use the red color, not to use the mala, so no blind man is annoyed by you.... Because I want to protect your eyes -- and they are very vulnerable because

you are in the situation of a child and just a fly can destroy your eyes. And these people are not flies, they are monsters.

The buddhafield has expanded its area, but its strategy has changed. Now I will depend on the individuals -- and individuals can move around the world, to faraway corners; still there will be a connecting link with me. Wherever there is a sannyasins of mine, I am there. He will be my mirror, he will reflect me and my light. He will transmit my energy, my understanding.

So you are right: just being together and working hard and running a disco and making money and doing all kinds of things does not seem enough. It is not enough. It is not only not enough, it is a sheer wastage.

So you work in the world; and it is a simple thing -- whenever you feel a deep urge to be with me, I will be available. You can always come to me.

To make it a reality, now we will not be having any celebrations; now the celebration will continue all the year round -- three hundred and sixty-five days of celebration! And I will be living somewhere, soon -- my people are searching for the right place for me to be. And all the year round you can come to me, whenever you have time. So there will be always three to five hundred people coming and going. And I would like a more intimate contact with you because now I am going to depend on the individual. You cannot understand how painful it has been for me that people longing for years to come, would come to the commune but then there would be twenty thousand people and they would not be able even to see me while I am speaking. I will not be able to see their faces, I will not be

able to look into their eyes -- and they have come from far away. Waiting for years, earning money, somehow they have managed to come. But with twenty thousand people gathering I cannot manage individual intimacy.
So my new format of work is going to be an all-year-round festival. So you are welcome any moment, because the festival will be continuous, so we don't collect twenty thousand or fifty thousand people at one time. We distribute people all over the year, so I can sit with you on the lawn, I can sit with you under the trees, I can sit with you under the stars, and I can talk to you or I can be silent with you. So when you go back you are full of me.
And this is going to be the new order of the buddhafield.

Question 2
BELOVED OSHO,
MEDITATION IS THE KEY. WHY IS IT SO DIFFICULT TO LIVE A MEDITATIVE LIFE WITHOUT YOUR PHYSICAL PRESENCE?

It is difficult because you have not yet been able to find your own source of meditation.
Being in my presence you need not meditate. Just being in my presence, a silence descends on you. Your heart has a different rhythm, your being feels a tremendous contentment.
But this is just a reflection. You should not be deceived by the reflection. Enjoy the reflection, let it penetrate as deeply in you as possible. But this is only an example, that if it can happen in my presence, why cannot it happen in my absence? -- because it is happening in you. I may be

functioning as a catalytic agent, but the source is within you; you just have to start trying it.

For example, you are in my presence and you feel meditation comes so easily; in fact you need not think about it, it is there. Just try sitting in your room. If it helps, remember me, visualize me, that I am sitting in front of you, and allow the same experience to happen again. You will be surprised; you don't know how capable your consciousness is. Just think: you had enjoyed a certain perfume....

Sufi mystics have even used it as part of their strategy; you will enjoy this certain perfume. Perhaps twenty years have passed: you can sit silently remembering it, bringing that experience of the perfume closer to you, bypassing the twenty years. And you will be surprised that suddenly the perfume is there. You can still smell it; twenty years have not been able to destroy it. It has remained somewhere deep in your consciousness, you can never forget it.

Sufi mystics have used it, although no Sufi has ever said so. Why? When you go to a Sufi master the first thing offered to you is perfume, and each Sufi master has his own perfume. He associates himself with that perfume because he knows the functioning of the consciousness: that a perfume cannot be forgotten. And whenever you remember the perfume you will have to remember the master; they become associated.

And every day it happens: you come to the master and the first thing is that he offers you the perfume. His place is full of the same perfume. The moment you enter you are engulfed in the perfume. Month by month, year by year, you live with the master. The perfume goes on penetrating

into the deepest layers of your consciousness -- and with the perfume, the master is also entering you.
Whenever you will be far away the instructions are: remember the perfume. And you will be surprised that whenever you remember the perfume, suddenly the presence of the master is there. And all that has been happening in the presence of the master starts happening in his absence. The source is within you.
These are just strategies. I have not been using anything like that, for the simple reason that I trust more in your love than in any association with something mundane.
If you love me, you can materialize me anywhere you want. And no perfume is higher than the perfume of love. No music is more musical than the music of love.
I have not used anything. In a few schools of mystics, music is used -- the same tune, so that whenever you hear the tune or remember the tune, you will be transported from your actual surroundings into those surroundings that you always wanted to be in.
But these are very mundane strategies. I would like to be more straightforward. I would not like anything to stand between me and you -- even to remind you. I want immediate contact. I want, categorically, immediacy, no mediator, because nothing works more miraculously than love.
All those old masters had to use other things because about love, they were afraid. Their own fear of love made them choose third-rate things to help you. I am not afraid of anything -- particularly of love.
So in my presence remember: meditation is easy because in my presence love is easy.

So wherever you are, be loving.
Be loving to the people you are with, be loving to the sky you see. Be loving to the trees you move by.
Just be loving -- and whenever you are thrilled with love you will find I am walking by your side, sitting by your side, that my hand is in your hand -- who says that I am far away? And you will immediately have the proof because mediation will be coming from all sides running, flooding you.
And once you have found it, that it can happen anywhere, then the last dependence has ended. Then my presence is no longer a need for you. That does not mean that you don't love me anymore; in fact, just the contrary. How can you love totally when there is some kind of dependence? You can love totally only when there is no dependence.
One of Buddha's intimate disciples, Sariputta, became enlightened in Buddha's lifetime. But he would not say it to Buddha, he was trying hard to hide it. He was doing things which only an unenlightened person can do.
Finally Buddha had to call him, and say, "Sariputta, you can't deceive me. You stop all this nonsense of doing things, saying things just to hide the fact that you have become enlightened. Why are you so afraid? Why don't you simply say what has happened?"
Sariputta said, "I am truly afraid. I was postponing this enlightenment as much as possible because I knew when I became enlightened you would say, `Sariputta, now you go, reach the people, help the people. Now you don't need me, so why do you go on hanging around?' I did everything to avoid it but what was to happen, has happened, and now you have found out -- please don't send me away."

Buddha said, "But you don't need me anymore. Your excuse to be with me for so many years was that without me you cannot become enlightened; now you have become enlightened, your excuse is no longer valid."

Sariputta's statement is very significant. He said, "Yes, my excuse is no longer valid, and I don't need you. But I am going to stay with you because it is you and your love that has made me so independent -- even independent of my own master. Just to show my gratitude, just to touch your feet every day.... I refuse to go anywhere else.

"I was with you up to now with a need; now I am going to be with you without any need. For the first time my love is simply pure -- no motivation, no desire... just pure gratitude."

When the need disappears, the gratitude arises. When dependence disappears, a tremendous feeling, that what you were and what you have become... the distance is so vast that unless the presence of the master was a miracle, it is not explainable.

So whenever you feel that it is difficult to meditate without me, remember my love for you, remember your love for me.

Love immediately destroys distances.

And you will find me as much present as I am here -- or even more. And once you have found it, then there is no problem: wherever you are, meditation is your own, it is your own energy. Still you can go on coming.

I am not so hard as Gautam Buddha. You must have seen Gautam Buddha's marble statues. He was just like that -- cold as a marble statue, even when he was alive. A

beautiful man, an immensely miraculous man, but he was very cold.
I am a totally different person. My compassion is not of somebody who is higher than you; my compassion is very human, because I understand the days of the dark nights. I have been through those dark nights -- I know how you must be suffering in those dark nights. But it is all up to you: you can prolong the dark night, or you can end it and bring the sunrise immediately into your life.
I have called you my friend. Remember that word.
I promise you to be with you whenever you need me. Just need me!

Question 3
BELOVED OSHO,
THE GERMAN MINISTRY OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS DOESN'T ALLOW YOU TO ENTER GERMANY. DO YOU WANT TO SAY ANYTHING ABOUT IT?

It seems that no government will allow me in any country. It is a good sign. It means they have started recognizing me.
I cannot be recognized by winning a Nobel Prize. I can be recognized only by the way America has treated me, India is treating me, Germany is treating me. But I am surprised about Germany. I have never been to Germany; naturally I cannot commit any crime in Germany under German law. It must be something unprecedented, that a person who has never been to your country, has not done any harm to your country -- you have to decide beforehand, in case he comes, that he should not be allowed to enter.

It shows a great recognition of a single individual who has no powers -- governments are so afraid. They must be wrong, there must be something that they are afraid of which my presence can expose.
I say it is a good sign -- I love it. I will refuse a Nobel Prize because that is bourgeois but I cannot refuse such a beautiful recognition; that simply fits with me.
One thing I would like to tell you is that Germany can prevent me from entering the country but it cannot prevent me from entering the heart of the German people, particularly German youth. And of course they cannot prevent me from allowing the German youth to enter into my heart.
And my work is invisible -- I need not go to Germany. But those who love me can come to me wherever I am. And if their love is strong enough then they can find me amongst them. I need not enter the country; still I can be with my sannyasins.
My presence depends on their love, not on the visa that the government issues.
But it simply shows the poverty of your so-called great powers. You should be happy and rejoice the day I cannot find any place to stay anywhere in the world. You have to dance and sing and rejoice that this is happening for the first time....
Because Socrates was condemned in Athens, and Athens was only a city state. The judges had told him, "You can leave Athens and there will be no punishment for you. And there is the whole world -- why should you unnecessarily get poisoned? Just leave Athens."

Jesus was crucified in Judea -- a very small place. Nobody had heard about him while he was alive. And he did not die on the cross either. Not that there was any resurrection; he was simply brought down from the cross within six hours -- and on the Jewish cross it needs twenty-four hours, sometimes forty-eight hours, for a person to die.

It was a negotiation between Pontius Pilate, the Roman governor, and one of the influential men who wanted Jesus to be saved. So this was the agreement: on Friday Jesus should be crucified -- but as late as possible so he is not too long on the cross. Jews stop all work as the sun sets on Friday, and Saturday is the day of sabbath; they don't do anything. So it was delayed as long as possible; only in the afternoon when the sun was going down was Jesus crucified. And before the sun set he had to be brought down because of the Jewish tradition.

Now he had to wait in the cave. He would have to be crucified again after the sabbath ends -- and that was the time when he was stolen. He was taken out of Judea. He lived in India up to one hundred and twelve years -- a very ripe age. He died in India -- I have been to his grave in Kashmir, and a strange coincidence: Kashmir has the graves of Jesus and Moses too.

But nowhere was he hindered, nowhere was he persecuted, nowhere was he crucified again. In India he lived a long life. He was thirty-three when he was crucified in Judea, and he lived up to one hundred and twelve years without any persecution.

So this is something to rejoice about, that I may be the first man in the whole of history who is being persecuted around the world. But this is not bad news, it is good news. It

means I have threatened all the powers of the world -- religious, political, social. A single man, single-handedly has been able to prove the impotency and poverty of all great powers, great theologians, great organized religions. What more reward can I receive?
And this is going to help the movement. It means you have got a master, not just a goody-goody saint!

Light on the Path

Chapter #14
Chapter title: Say it with your totality
14 January 1986 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
I HAVE BEEN TRYING TO SAY WHAT AN ENLIGHTENED MASTER IS. I TRY FROM EACH ANGLE, AND EVERY MORNING, WHEN I SIT AT MY PIANO, I TRY TO SING THE SONG FROM ANOTHER PERSPECTIVE, WITH ANOTHER TUNE, ANOTHER MELODY.
BUT MY PEOPLE IN THE WEST HAVE NEVER HEARD SUCH STORIES, AND I CAN SEE THAT MY WORDS NEVER REACH THE TARGET. I CAN'T KEEP MY MOUTH CLOSED, AND I GO ON TRYING TO FIND THE WORDS TO SAY IT.
IF I HAVE TO GIVE A TITLE TO THIS BOOK, IT WILL BE, "THE WORDS TO SAY IT" -- BECAUSE I CAN'T GIVE UP, I CAN'T SHOW MY SILENCE --

NEITHER MY TEARS, NEITHER MY LAUGHTER. PLEASE, HELP ME TO FIND THE WORDS TO SAY IT, TO EXPLAIN TO MY PEOPLE IN THE VALLEY WHAT ENLIGHTENMENT IS, WHAT AN ENLIGHTENED MASTER IS.

It is not only your difficulty, it is as old as man himself. The efforts that you are making have been made down the centuries by thousands of poets, painters, musicians, sculptors -- all kinds of creative beings -- trying to say that which cannot be said. They all have known it -- that it cannot be said -- but still, there is a tremendous longing in the heart of man to say it, to express it, to convey it to those he loves, to those he wants to understand.

There is a great challenge, perhaps the greatest... one experiences it, one feels it, one is almost very close to expressing it -- but still, the target is missed. Because the target is continuously missed, the challenge becomes greater, bigger.

So I can understand your problem, but you will have to understand that there are things you can try to say but you will not succeed. One should not long for success either; just the effort is enough success. You tried your best, you put yourself totally into it. You were not half-hearted. But if, in the very nature of things it is impossible, what more can you do?

The experience of enlightenment happens when there are no words, no thoughts. The mind itself is left far behind. You cannot even hear the heartbeats; it is an absolute emptiness.

It is not light, it is not darkness. It is something beyond both.

What it is does not exist in the world we know. So there is no parallel, not even a far away symmetry which can give some indication about it. And whenever we want to say something about it, we will have to bring the mind in -- which was not present in the experience. We will have to bring words in -- which were absent.

This is the whole absurdity, that you are making eye-witnesses of those who were absolutely absent. They can try, but they are groping in the dark. All their efforts are so small, and the experience is so vast -- no word can contain it.

Whenever I close my eyes, and I see, it is utter emptiness... not even a flicker -- unlimited, something belonging to eternity. Mind belongs to time; it has no idea of eternity. It can make one up, but its idea of eternity will be nothing but time stretched as far as the mind can go. But it will still be time; and it has two ends to it, the beginning and the end. It is not eternity.

What can mind do? -- it can only stretch time; that is its experience. It can make it longer and longer, but however long it is, it has a beginning, it has an end; it is not eternity.

The mind thinks about truth. It thinks about truth only because it knows not. Thinking is the blind man's game. It is only the blind man who thinks about light. When you have eyes, you simply see it, you don't think about it. And what can you think about it? When you are facing the light, seeing it, knowing it, there is nothing to think about it.

And when the light is not there and you are blind, what can you think about it? Whatever you think is going to be

wrong. It cannot even be a far-fetched similarity to the experience of light.

In the West you will find it even more difficult to explain to people what it is. It is of tremendous importance to note that in India there has never existed anything like philosophy -- never, because philosophy is a thinking process, it is of the mind; it does not go beyond mind. It is logic, but it is not an experience.

What has existed in the East is a totally different thing: we have called it seeing, not thinking, not philosophy.

Gautam Buddha said of himself that, "I am not a philosopher, I am a physician. Don't ask me what light is. If you don't have eyes, come to me and I will cure your eyes -- that I can do, but don't ask me what light is. I cannot answer. I can cure your eyes and then it is up to you to know what light is."

In the West there has never been anything like darshana, seeing, which is beyond thinking. So it is more difficult, and you will find it almost impossible, in every step a failure. The best of music still falls short because even the best of music is nothing but sound -- and the experience is silence, not sound. And you are trying to express silence through sound.

The best of poetry may give people who do not know great flights into the unknown, glimpses. But to those who know, the question is not flights into the unknown, but entry into the unknowable.

The unknown can become known any moment. Science tries to make the unknown, known: what was unknown yesterday is known today; what is unknown today will be known tomorrow. And the scientific mind thinks there will

come a time -- it is very logical -- that we will have claimed all that is unknown within the boundaries of the known. That will be the victory, the ultimate victory of science -- that no unknown is left anymore.

But they are not aware that there is something more than the unknown, and that is the world of the unknowable -- which cannot be reduced to the known.

So poetry, painting, may sometimes bring you very close to the unknown. But enlightenment is not of the unknown, it is of the unknowable. You can experience it but you cannot explain it. And it is not your failure, it is just the nature of how things are. It is something existential.

Still, I will not say, don't try to say it. I will say, continue trying to say it. My purpose is different: not that you will be able to say it, but in the very effort of saying it, something in you will be changed, something in you will be transformed. Every failure in expressing it will bring you closer to the silence that can only be experienced. So every failure can become a stepping stone.

And don't be worried that people cannot understand what you are trying so hard to explain to them. Go on trying. It is not that your explanation is going to succeed, to reach the target -- that is out of the question. But your very effort, your desperate effort, your tears, may be able to move those people's hearts.

Your words cannot do anything, but your sincere effort is going to create a quest in those people... that there is something, certainly, that the man is trying to explain -- and is not able to explain. But his tears are proof, his constant effort in spite of all the failures is proof. His finding new ways, new angles every day, is proof that the man has

something; perhaps it is the nature of the thing that it cannot be explained.

And they know things which cannot be explained in their ordinary experience too. They cannot explain love. Even the greatest scientist falls in love, knowing perfectly that he cannot explain what it is. And what he can explain he knows it is not that. He can explain the hormones, the attraction between female and male hormones, and the whole biology of it. But he knows it is not that. He cannot explain it; he cannot bring it to the level where things can be explained.

Even in ordinary life -- you taste something, but you cannot explain the taste. You smell a fragrance but is there any way to explain it? -- and particularly to those people who have lost their sensitivity to smell. They may not be convinced by your words, but they will be convinced by your effort -- and that may trigger an enquiry in them... perhaps you are right.

And that's what, down the ages, people have tried. If they have come in contact with a master, they have come in contact with a living experience of enlightenment. They know it is there; it has become almost tangible to them. They have felt it in their very heartbeat, in their very breathing. They have seen it; and naturally, they would like to communicate it.

They are burdened with a tremendous experience, and they want to wake people up: "What are you doing? There is something more to life -- don't waste your life this way! I have seen it. I have lived moments in the presence of some mysterious experience."

Perhaps they will think you crazy, they will think you mad. Don't be worried about it -- it has always been so. But if your madness is total, it is going to leave a deep impression on them. If your madness has a joy in it, a blissfulness around it, it is impossible for them to ignore it.

They would like to ignore it, for the simple reason that you are driving them onto a dangerous path: perhaps they will become just as mad as you are. They would prefer that nothing like the experience you are talking about exists. It is an effort to defend themselves. In fact their very attempt to ignore you, to condemn you, to call you a madman, shows you have already made some way into their heart. These are defense measures. They are creating a wall between you and themselves -- but that is the beginning of their defeat. Defense is the beginning of defeat: they have already become afraid, frightened.

So I will say, go on saying it. You will never be able to say it, but many things will happen in the effort of saying it. People are searching, knowingly or unknowingly, for something which is not part of their mundane life. They are tired and bored, but they want to be clear before they enter into any enquiry. That's why they want exact descriptions, explanations; they ask all kinds of questions.

It is simply for safety. They have lost their life; now a very small part is left, and they are afraid to gamble it. So you should be compassionate towards them. Don't get angry that they do not understand you. Don't stop trying to say it because they are not hearing you, because you are not succeeding in reaching them.

Life's ways are very mysterious.

You want to say something about the unknowable. You will not be able to say it, but in the very effort, you can change the life pattern of the person. You can give him new dreams and new hopes.

That's what I have been doing my whole life -- selling dreams... hopes.

Neither you can say it, nor I can say it. My whole life I have been trying to say it, knowing perfectly well it is an impossible task. It has never happened and it is not going to happen. And it is good that it is not going to happen... so something remains above mind, always in absolute purity, unpolluted.

I have been setting people on fire.

I don't succeed in saying it, but as a by-product -- of my arduous effort to say it -- putting my whole being put at stake in saying it -- there are other things happening on the side. The person is set on fire. He starts looking for something which cannot be said.

I have failed in a way. I have succeeded in another.

In fact, failing in saying it is not important. Succeeding in setting a man aflame is the real success. You have not missed the target. What helps is not your words but the way they are said, the authority with which they are said, the living quality of your words -- that they are coming from the very center of your being. You are not playing a mindgame; what you are saying is not just part of your thinking... the quality of your words will give the sense that they are part of your living. And that quality goes on making an impression.

So it is a very strange phenomenon: you cannot say it, and still you have to continue to say it. Words may fail but there is something which will transpire.
Just be total. Don't hold anything back. If tears want to come, let them come. Everything is significant.
Every gesture is significant. Even gaps are tremendously meaningful. No one knows what is going to leave an impression on the other. So you have to make a total effort. Something is going to happen; it has always happened.
The story is about Gautam Buddha: the night he became enlightened, he remained silent for seven days, for the simple reason that what is the use of saying it when it cannot be said? And it was absolutely clear to him that it is not possible to say it. Then why unnecessarily waste your time and other people's time?
The story is very beautiful. In Buddhist mythology there is no God, but there are gods. Gods are the people who are living in heaven. Heaven is just a holiday place. Those who earn virtue, those who live religiously, are rewarded -- a weekend; these people are called gods. But they are not higher than an enlightened being; they are far lower, because once their virtue is finished and their account is closed, they fall back to the mundane, ordinary world again.
The same happens to those who are committing all kinds of sins: they will be thrown into hell. When their punishment is complete, they come back to the ordinary world. So even heaven and hell are just reward-and-punishment systems. The enlightened person does not go to heaven because he is freed from all sin, from all virtue: he is free from the mind

itself. He simply dissolves into existence; he becomes one with the ocean.

So the gods in heaven became very much worried that Buddha is not going to speak -- and in centuries... it is rarely that somebody becomes a Buddha. So seven gods representing the whole of heaven came down to Buddha, touched his feet, and asked him to speak. "Because for centuries the earth waits, and if you remain silent, we will not be benefited by your enlightenment. You have to share it."

Buddha said, "That which cannot be said, how can I say it? You know perfectly well it cannot be said, so what is the point in saying it? In fact, by saying it, you are distorting it. The moment truth is said, it becomes a lie. So please forgive me -- I cannot do it."

The gods were very much puzzled. They talked amongst themselves... what to do, how to convince him -- what he is saying is right, but he has to be convinced to speak. Truth cannot be said, no, we have heard for centuries it cannot be said; but while a man of truth speaks... it is not only the words, there are many more things -- his eyes, his hands, his whole being. The words may not be able to say it, but they create a ground in which people can be pulled. And they can see his eyes, they can see his being, they can see his silence. They can see his blissfulness, they can see his contentment. That's what convinces them -- not his words.

So they said to Buddha, "We understand: ninety-nine percent of the people perhaps may not understand you, but why are you forgetting the one percent? And even if one percent of the people understand you, it will bring a transformation in the whole consciousness of man."

Buddha said, "Those one percent I have not forgotten, but those are the people who will attain to enlightenment whether I speak or not -- maybe a few years later or a few lives later. But that one percent you are talking about who can understand me, they can not be prevented from enlightenment any longer.

"So what is the point? They will get it. And in this eternity of time, what does it matter if you get it today or tomorrow or the day after tomorrow?"

Again the gods insisted; they said, "We understand you, but there may be a few who are just on the verge, and they need only a little push, a little conviction that they are not going to risk everything for nothing. Your presence will convince them that it is worth risking everything. And they are just on the verge: only one step, and they are holding back the step because they don't know what is in the unknown, what is in the unknowable. They can't see anything; so why lose whatever you have got for that which is uncertain? It may be, it may not be.

"Your presence will give them courage to take the last step. And you know perfectly well they can remain hanging on the verge for millions of lives -- the same fear. Your presence will take away the fear. They will know that going into the unknown and the unknowable is not a risk; it is the only thing that is not a risk.

"In life, everything is risky. That is the only thing which is absolutely certain. Your presence will give them that certainty, and the courage to take the last step. You will have to speak."

Buddha pondered over it, and he said, "Perhaps you are right, because I remember my own situation: that last step

was the most difficult, because I had nobody who could convince me by his presence that `You are not going to simply disappear into nothingness; you will come out of it radiant, with eternal life.'

"I know how many lives I have been hanging at the last step. I will speak. I will speak for those who are just on the verge." And he spoke for forty-two years -- still he has not been able to say the truth. But he helped hundreds of people to attain truth.

So don't be worried that you are not succeeding in saying it. Nobody succeeds in saying it -- but success comes through other ways. Saying it creates a situation.

Even if a few people can start moving, that's enough. And in their movement, you will find yourself moving. When you see a conviction arising in somebody's eyes, you will be convinced a thousandfold. So it is not only for others -- it is for you too. Say it in as many ways as possible.

So one thing has to be remembered: say it with your totality, because that is what is going to change the other person, his perspective. And when you say it with your totality, your words start having a life of their own.

I don't know even the ABC of oratory.... Once I was taken to a Christian theological college. The principal was my friend, and he was insisting that some time I should come and see how they prepare their missionaries.

And I was simply amazed: they were teaching people everything -- when you have to speak loudly; when you have to speak very softly, almost in a whisper; when you have to raise your hands -- at what point of your sermon which gesture has to be made....

I said to the principal, "This is simply stupid! This is not education -- you are destroying these people. This is all false, phony. You should not call it a religious institute; you are teaching acting."

I have never learned anything about oratory -- there is no need. What you need is some authentic experience, and then it starts finding its own ways. And I have been speaking to millions of people, just talking to them heart to heart. I myself don't know what is going to be my next statement. I don't know what my hands are doing, what gestures are coming; I don't know what my eyes are doing. I simply know one thing, that when I am saying something, I am saying it with my body, with my mind, with my soul -- with my everything put at stake. And when you have something to say, it finds its own way.

Of course you will never be able to say the truth, but by saying it you may be able to approach peoples' hearts. You may trigger some pilgrimage in them -- and that is more than one can expect.

So go on saying it; go on making the effort, knowing perfectly well there is no way to say it.

For centuries people have understood this, and yet they went on saying it, because they became aware that between the words, between the lines, something goes on transpiring -- and that is the real thing.

Light on the Path

Chapter #15

Chapter title: With a master the long journey can be cut short

16 January 1986 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
A ZEN MASTER SAID, "SITTING SILENTLY, DOING NOTHING, AND THE GRASS GROWS BY ITSELF." BUDDHA SAID, "BE A LIGHT UNTO YOURSELF." I AGREE IN TOTO. SO WHAT IS THE NEED FOR A MASTER? CANNOT AN INTELLIGENT AND COURAGEOUS MAN WALK ALONE?
HOW TO EXPLAIN WHAT A MASTER IS IN A COUNTRY WHERE "MASTER" ONLY MEANS "ONE WHO OWNS PEOPLE"?

There is no need for a master.
An intelligent and courageous man can walk alone -- but he will have to walk many lives before he comes to the point. With a master the long journey can be cut short.
Walking alone, you don't know where you are going. You know where you want to go, but there is no map. And there are not paved roads to the truth. As you walk you make the path; it is not already there. And there are thousands of doors.
The person who is walking alone will have to knock on each of the doors; and all the doors don't lead to the truth. There is only one door in those thousands of doors which leads to the truth. A man walking alone will have to depend on some coincidence that he happens to knock on the right door; otherwise he will have to eliminate all the wrong doors by knocking on them, finding that they are not the

right one, until finally all wrong doors are eliminated, and only the right one is left.

This can take thousands of lives. The journey will be infinitely long -- so long that the courageous man may lose courage, the intelligent man may get fed up with all that. And rather than reaching the goal, he may turn his back on the whole pilgrimage.

Yes, it is possible without a master, but the difficulties are tremendous. The master does not lead you to the truth because he has already traveled the path: he has already found the right door, the right method. He can help you to eliminate the wrong doors.

In other words the function of the master is not to give you the truth but to make you aware what is false, to make you aware what is not truth. He cuts your journey down to the shortest possible way.

And a master is not a person who owns people. One who owns people is not a master at all: he is a politician. He is on a power trip.

A master can only be a master if he does not own people, but loves them.

Love never owns. Love gives without asking anything in return. Love makes no conditions. Love has no expectations.

A master is only a friend. He is not higher than the people he is leading towards a certain experience. He has no superiority complex. He does not create any guilt, any inferiority, any kind of spiritual slavery -- because these are the barriers to finding the experience he is teaching.

Only an independent, totally autonomous being, living in freedom, can attain to the experience of truth.

So how can the master own the people? He makes every effort to help -- and this help does not create any obligation on those who are being helped. On the contrary the master feels obliged that you accepted his help. You could have rejected it; there was no necessity to accept it.

It is just a theoretical thing that the master is not needed. Practically it is almost impossible to find the way without the master, because there are so many ways, and they don't all lead to truth.

And you don't have unlimited courage. It will soon be finished. After wandering on a few paths and finding nothing, you will be discouraged. Each failure is going to become a discouragement. Soon you will start wondering whether there is any truth at all. "Am I searching for a hallucination, searching for something that does not exist?" Your intelligence, howsoever sharp, will start losing its sharpness when you come again and again against failure. Whatever man has, needs nourishment. His courage needs nourishment. His intelligence needs nourishment -- and nourishment comes through success. If you are succeeding, you will become more and more intelligent, more and more courageous... getting ready to take a quantum leap into the unknown. But if on every step there is failure, darkness, the courage will disappear. The intelligence will start losing its sharpness, its brilliance.

It is mostly going to be the case that soon you will forget all about truth, the search. You may even become an enemy of all those who are talking about truth and the search for it. You may start saying that it is all nonsense, it is just groping in the dark... just like the definition of a blind philosopher looking in a dark house in the dark night for a

black cat which is not there. How long can you keep your courage?

Buddha has a beautiful story about it. He says there is a palace of one thousand doors, and a blind man is trying to find the right door to get out of it. All the doors are open. He goes on searching for the right door; he becomes tired -- such a tedious thing that each door proves to be just a facade. It is not a door; behind each door there is only a wall. The door is open -- but when he enters he hits his head against the wall.

He starts becoming discouraged, although he has been told there is one door, certainly one door, which will take him out -- and all doors are open. And by the time he reaches the right door, he is so tired, so fed up. He has passed nine hundred and ninety-nine doors, and they all have proved wrong doors. It is a natural conclusion that this door is also going to be one of them. He does not try it -- he passes by it.

He has tried enough. You cannot blame that man, he is blind -- and hitting his head on nine hundred and ninety-nine doors and finding they are all walls.... You cannot blame him if he decides to leave this one and save at least one hit more. He moves on and starts knocking again on wrong doors.

Buddha used to say that you cannot condemn that man. You have to be compassionate -- he is blind and his experience of so many failures discourages him. And he misses the right door. He simply does not try -- he is tired. Perhaps one round more and he may drop the whole idea of getting out.

Perhaps it is just a fallacy that there is a door that opens towards the world of light, sun, flowers, and sky and stars. Perhaps this is all there is. And those who have been telling him about the right door may have been simply deceiving him, perhaps they are deceived themselves.

What is theoretically possible is not necessarily practically the right thing. Every master will say you can go alone, you can find the truth on your own; there is no need of a master. And only a master will say that. But he will also make it clear to you that you are choosing a very long journey. You may be tired, you may drop out of the search; you may turn your back towards truth. You may even become antagonistic to the very idea. The master is a practical necessity.

And the master is only a lover. He loves truth, and he loves to help people to reach that wonderful experience.

He is just like a gardener. Whenever there are flowers coming to the plants it is not only that the flowers blossom, something in the heart of the gardener also blossoms with each flower. The same is true about the master. Each time a disciple reaches the goal, attains his potentiality, blossoms, something in the master's heart also blossoms. With each disciple becoming enlightened, the master becomes again and again enlightened.

That is the master's reward. He does not want anything from the disciple. His reward is in the success of the disciple.

So always remain aware of the distinction between what is theoretical and what is practical.

You have quoted Basho, an authentic master: "Sitting silently, doing nothing, and the grass grows by itself." This

is the theoretical position, and every great master will agree with it -- that all that is needed is that you sit silently, don't do anything. On your part doing is not needed. Don't start pulling the grass in order to make it grow. You simply sit silently, the grass grows by itself.

But this is a theoretical statement. Who is going to teach you to sit silently? That is the most difficult thing in the world. You can do everything very easily, and the easiest thing -- to sit silently -- seems to be the most difficult.

You will need a master for many reasons. First, as an example; otherwise soon you will find that you cannot sit silently. That's how the mind works, to console itself: "It is not my fault that I cannot sit silently; it is just human nature. Nobody can sit silently. I have never seen anybody sitting silently doing nothing."

The first function of the master is to prevent you from drawing such a conclusion. You know at least one man who sits silently. There is one man, at least, who is capable of not doing anything, just being. And if it is possible for one man, it is possible for all men.

And secondly: you will need some method, some strategy, to help you to sit silently and not to do anything. Each master develops devices -- sometimes very strange, sometimes very obvious. It all depends on what kind of disciple he is going to help.

This haiku is from Basho, but he himself helped many people, helped the grass to grow -- in spite of his statement which has become world famous. Nobody has bothered that he has helped much grass to grow.

He has given a certain kind of meditation to one disciple: to listen to the sound of one hand clapping. The disciple

knows that there cannot be any sound from one hand. Whatever you do, sound needs at least two things to clash; one hand won't do. But the master says, "Try. Sit down and try, and when you find something that is the sound of one hand clapping, come back and report."

And every morning the disciple comes. The night before, he heard the wind passing through the pine trees, and he thought, "Perhaps this is the sound of one hand clapping." In the morning he rushes to the master, and he tells him, touching his feet, "I have heard it! It is the sound of the wind passing through the pine trees."

The master gives him a good slap and says, "You idiot! I have told you to find the sound of one hand clapping. The wind and the pine trees are two hands. Go back and start meditating."

The disciple comes back again and again. Sometimes the sound of the water running... and he thinks, "Perhaps this is it!" But the master is difficult: the disciple is tired, and all that he gets is a slap on his face. He tells the master that he heard the sound of running water.

The master says, "You won't listen to me!" He simply takes hold of him and throws him out of the window! It is a three-story house, and they are on the top floor. And not only does the master throw the disciple out of the window, he jumps after him, on top of him, and asks him, "Have you heard it?"

For a moment there is absolute silence. The disciple cannot believe what has happened. He had never thought that Basho, such a gentle man, will do anything like this. He is simply shocked. And now the master, sitting on his chest asks him, "Have you heard it?"

The shock, the situation -- and for a moment time stops, mind stops, and the disciple smiles. And Basho says, "That is it! But you forced me to do something which I don't do ordinarily. You were harassing me every morning with all kinds of nonsense things."

Yes, the grass grows by itself. But man is not grass. He needs a guide, he needs a benevolent master. He needs a friend who at times can be really hard, a friend to create devices around him. This disciple would have waited for lives to hear the sound of one hand clapping.

And this is a spontaneous act on the part of Basho. It is not a considered act, he has not thought about it. It is just that the moment he feels it, he does it. The disciple has a few fractures, but those fractures will heal; they don't matter. What matters is that the shock of getting thrown out of the window, and the master jumping onto him was something so unexpected that the mind had to stop.

Mind can only function with the expected, with the known. When there is something unexpected, unknown, then it has to stop. And the stopping of the mind is the sound of one hand clapping. It is silence.

Now the disciple knows what silence is. Now he can sit in silence doing nothing and letting the grass grow by itself. But the first taste of silence -- who is going to give it to you? Only one who has tasted it.

It is of immense importance not to be lost in theoretical assumptions, and to always remain in the world of the practical, because it is there that things happen. Once they have happened then the theoretical seems to be perfectly right -- but only once they have happened.

A master is only a support when you are not able to walk on your own.

If a child is not helped by the mother to start walking on his own feet.... She is very protective. She takes care that he does not fall into a ditch, she takes care that he does not get hurt. She provokes the child, she challenges the child: "You can do it. I am here, you will not fall -- I will support you." But the first steps of a child -- for the child it is entering into an unknown world.

If left alone, no child will stand up on his feet; he will walk on all fours all his life. This is a proven fact, because many times children have been found in jungles, in caves, living with wolves. Some motherly wolf has taken the child from the city, and she has been feeding the child.... But because all the wolves are moving on all fours, the child also walks on all fours. Nobody has challenged him to stand up on two legs: "Change your position from the horizontal to the vertical."

A few years ago one boy was found near Lucknow in India. He was fourteen years old, but he was not able to stand up. It took six months for doctors to help him to stand. Then too, whenever he was left alone, he would walk on all fours. It was only under compulsion that he would stand on his two feet. It was too difficult, and he was very hesitant, afraid, nervous.

Theoretically, man is capable of walking on two legs, but practically a mother is needed, a motherly milieu is needed, in which he can feel supported and unafraid -- even if he falls, he will not get hurt. And sometimes he will fall, but slowly he will get the knack. Then the mother is not needed. Then for the whole of his life he will not remember

at all that he is walking because of a mother; otherwise he would have not been walking on two legs.

In the spiritual world it is a little more complicated and a little more subtle. The master is playing many roles. He is a friend, he is a guide, he is a mother. And in every way he is trying to give you the first experience. That first experience triggers a series of experiences. And then you can sit alone, silently.

And the real master never wants you to remain dependent on him. He wants to make you independent as soon as possible... the quicker the better.

So he finds all the shortcuts. And he is aware of the whole area -- he has traveled on all the paths. He has seen it from all the angles. He knows where you are, and he knows where the truth is. The shortest distance between two points is a straight line; and that is the function of the master -- to create a straight line between you and the truth.

Just the other day an old man was asking me -- he is the private secretary of the king of Nepal -- "I don't expect that, in this life, I will be able to experience anything you talk about."

I said, "Why? Why are you so discouraged? What I am talking about can be experienced within a second. All that you need is to listen to me carefully and just to make an effort. There is no need to wait for another life. Perhaps you have been doing it in your past lives too, and you are just repeating an old habit, that it cannot happen in this small life. You are thinking, `Now almost two-thirds is gone, one-third is left: how can I manage such a big experience?'"

And as I talked with him and I gave him a meditation -- to just witness his breathing -- I understood what the difficulty was. He was not listening to me. While I was talking to him, giving him a method, he was preparing in his mind what he had to say after I stopped.

And as I stopped, he did not continue with what I was saying to him. He immediately jumped to something which had no connection with what was said to him. Just to give the appearance that it was connected, he said, "Except for witnessing the breathing... I have been sleeping very soundly -- I don't have any dreams."

I had told him that if you go to sleep watching your breath, you will wake up watching your breath. And that is an absolute proof that you have got the method, you have got a grip on it -- because whatsoever is the last thought when you go to sleep, continues to be there the whole night, and is always the first thought in the morning. It waits eight hours.

So he said, "Except for watching the breath.... This is my experience, that whatever thought I sleep with is the first thought in the morning. Driving on a silent road in the faraway parts of Nepal, I feel so overwhelmed with blissfulness that tears come to my eyes and I have to stop driving because I cannot see."

I asked him, "Who has told you to do these things?"

He said, "No one. I have been trying on my own."

I said, "Then I can understand why the fear is there that you are not going to make it in this life. Perhaps you aren't going to make in this life. These are just fragments -- you don't know the whole. And you don't know how to put these fragments together to make the whole.

"You have not been with a master. You are just doing -- in a haphazard way -- anything that you may have read somewhere, heard somewhere. But spiritual experience is an organic unity. You need a man who has the vision of the whole before him. He can give you the key from where to start, so you don't end up with fragments here and there. They will not be of any use. They will be simply deceiving you that you are on the path."

Practically, the master is an absolute necessity. But remember that the master does not own people. The master is not the master of people; the master is the master of himself.

People are attracted to him because of his mastery. They are not to be enslaved. If anybody is enslaving them -- and that is what your so-called religions go on doing -- then that man is pseudo, and he is going to destroy you rather than create a new man in you.

So this is the basic indication of who a master is: he does not enslave you. On the contrary he gives you total freedom. And if you choose to do something, you choose. It is not being forced upon you, it is your choice.

The master can make things available to you, but the choice is always yours. And the master will not have any kind of superiority over you. His emphasis will be continuously, "I am just a human being -- not a prophet, not a messiah, not a savior of humanity. I am just a human being as you are. If there is any difference, it is very little. The difference is that I am awake and you are still asleep."

But the very phenomenon that you are asleep is an indication that you can be awake. A dead man is not asleep,

so he cannot be awake. Being asleep or being awake is the same energy.
The perfect master convinces you that you are as capable as he is of having all the experiences that can uplift you from the ordinary, mundane world into a spiritual paradise, herenow.

Light on the Path

Chapter #16
Chapter title: I want a meeting of east and west
17 January 1986 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
YOU HAVE BEEN USING THE KEY WORD "DEPROGRAMMING" TO DESCRIBE YOUR WORK. THE TECHNIQUES THAT YOU HAVE SUGGESTED DURING THESE YEARS, GO FROM CHAOTIC AND DYNAMIC MEDITATION TO THE MODERN THERAPEUTIC SCHOOL.
I WOULD LIKE YOU TO EXPLAIN IN BRIEF WHY YOU HAD TO CREATE NEW MEDITATION TECHNIQUES LIKE KUNDALINI MEDITATION OR DYNAMIC MEDITATION, EVEN THOUGH THERE IS A TRADITION ALREADY INCLUDING HUNDREDS OF TECHNIQUES FROM YOGA, SUFISM, BUDDHISM ETC.
WHAT IS ALSO SURPRISING TO THE WEST IS THAT YOU ARE USING THERAPIES SUCH AS GESTALT,

PRIMAL, ENCOUNTER, IN YOUR COMMUNE. IS IT REALLY NECESSARY?
THE SUSPICION IS THAT YOUR SECRET INTENTIONS ARE NOTHING BUT TO BRAINWASH PEOPLE'S MINDS, AND THAT CANNOT BE TOLERATED BECAUSE YOU ARE TOUCHING THE MOST PRECIOUS THING THEY HAVE.

The ancient methods of meditation were all developed in the East. They never considered the Western man, the Western man was excluded. I am creating techniques which are not only for the Eastern man, which are simply for every man -- Eastern or Western.
There is a difference between the Eastern tradition and the Western tradition -- and it is the tradition that creates the mind. For example, the Eastern mind is very patient -- thousands of years of teaching to remain patient, whatever the conditions may be.
The Western mind is very impatient. The same methods of technique cannot be applicable to both.
The Eastern mind has been conditioned to keep a certain equilibrium in success or in failure, in richness or in poverty, in sickness or in health, in life or in death. The Western mind has no idea of such equilibrium; it gets too disturbed. With success it gets disturbed; it starts feeling at the top of the world, starts feeling a certain superiority complex. In failure it goes to the other extreme; it falls into the seventh hell. It is miserable, in deep anguish, and it feels a tremendous inferiority complex. It is torn apart.
And life consists of both. There are moments which are beautiful, and there are moments which are ugly. There are

moments when you are in love, there are moments when you are in anger, in hatred. The Western mind simply goes with the situation. It is always in a turmoil. The Eastern mind has learnt... it is a conditioning, it is not a revolution, it is only a training, a discipline, it is a practice. Underneath it is the same, but a thick conditioning makes it keep a certain balance.

The Eastern mind is very slow because there is no point in being speedy; life takes its own course and everything is determined by fate, so what you get, you don't get by your speed, your hurry. What you get, you get because it is already destined. So there is no question of being in a hurry. Whenever something is going to happen, it is going to happen -- neither one second before nor one second after it.

This has created a very slow flow in the East. It seems almost as if the river is not flowing; it is so slow that you cannot detect the flow. Moreover, the Eastern conditioning is that you have already lived millions of lives, and there are millions ahead to be lived, so the life span is not only seventy years; the life span is vast and enormous. There is no hurry; there is so much time available: why should you be in a hurry? If it does not happen in this life, it may happen in some other life.

The Western mind is very speedy, fast, because the conditioning is for only one life -- seventy years -- and so much to do. One third of your life goes into sleep, one third of your life goes into education, training -- what is left? Much of it goes into earning your livelihood. If you count everything, you will be surprised: out of seventy years you cannot even have seven years left for something that you

want to do. Naturally there is hurry, a mad rush, so mad that one forgets where one is going. All that you remember is whether you are going with speed or not. The means becomes the end.

In the same way, in different directions... the Eastern mind has cultivated itself differently than the Western mind. Those one hundred and twelve methods of meditation developed in the East have never taken account of the Western man; they were not developed for the Western man. The Western man was not yet available. The time that VIGYAN BHAIRVA TANTRA was written -- in which those one hundred and twelve techniques have come to perfection -- is nearabout five to ten thousand years before us.

At that time there was no Western man, no Western society, no Western culture. The West was still barbarous, primitive, not worth taking into account. The East was the whole world, at the pinnacle of its growth, richness, civilization.

My methods of meditation have been developed out of an absolute necessity. I want the distinction between the West and the East to be dissolved.

After Shiva's VIGYAN BHAIRVA TANTRA, in these five or ten thousand years, nobody has developed a single method. But I have been watching the differences between East and West: the same method cannot be applied immediately to both. First, the Eastern and the Western mind have to be brought into a similar state. Those techniques of dynamic meditation, kundalini meditation, and others, are all cathartic; their basis is catharsis.

You have to throw out all the junk that your mind is full of. Unless you are unloaded you cannot sit silently. It is just as if you tell a child to sit silently in the corner of the room. It is very difficult, he is so full of energy. You are repressing a volcano! The best way is, first tell him, "Go run outside around the house ten times; then come and sit down in the corner."

Then it is possible, you have made it possible. He himself wants to sit down now, to relax. He is tired, he is exhausted; now, sitting there, he is not repressing his energy, he has expressed his energy by running around the house ten times. Now he is more at ease.

The cathartic methods are simply to throw all your impatience, your speediness, your hurry, your repressions. One more factor has to be remembered, that these are absolutely necessary for the Western man before he can do something like vipassana -- just sitting silently doing nothing and the grass grows by itself. But you have to be sitting silently, doing nothing -- that is a basic condition for the grass to grow by itself. If you cannot sit silently doing nothing, you are going to disturb the grass.

I have always loved gardens, and wherever I have lived I have created beautiful gardens, lawns. I used to talk to people sitting on my lawn, and I became aware that they were all pulling the grass out... just hectic energy. If they had nothing to do they would simply pull the grass. I had to tell them, "If you go on doing this, then you will have to sit inside the room. I cannot allow you to destroy my lawn." They would stop themselves for a while, and as they started listening to me, again unconsciously, their hands would start pulling at the grass. So sitting silently doing nothing is

not really just sitting silently and doing nothing. It is doing a big favor to the grass. Unless you are not doing anything, the grass cannot grow; you will stop it, you will pull it out, you will disturb it.

So these methods are absolutely necessary for the Western mind. But a new factor has also entered: they have become necessary for the Eastern mind too. The mind for which Shiva wrote those one hundred and twelve methods of meditation no longer exists -- even in the East now. The Western influence has been tremendous. Things have changed.

In Shiva's time there was no Western civilization. The East was at its peak of glory; it was called "a golden bird." It had all the luxuries and comforts: it was really affluent.

Now the situation is reversed: the East has been in slavery for two thousand years, exploited by almost everyone in the world, invaded by a dozen countries, continuously looted, raped, burned. It is now a beggar.

And three hundred years of British rule in India have destroyed India's own educational system -- which was a totally different thing. They forced the Eastern mind to be educated according to Western standards. They have almost turned the Eastern intelligentsia into a second-grade Western intelligentsia. They have given their disease of speediness, of hurry, of impatience, of continuous anguish, anxiety, to the East.

If you see the temples of Khajuraho or the temples of Konarak, you can see the East in its true colors.

Just in Khajuraho there were one hundred temples; only thirty have survived, seventy have been destroyed by Mohammedans. Thousands of temples of tremendous

beauty and sculpture have been destroyed by Mohammedans. These thirty survived; it was just coincidence, because they were part of a forest. Perhaps the invaders forgot about them.

But the British influence on the Indian mind was so great, that even a man like Mahatma Gandhi wanted these thirty temples to be covered with mud so nobody could see them. Just to think of the people who had created those hundred temples... each temple must have taken centuries to build. They are so delicate in structure, so proportionate and so beautiful, that there exists nothing parallel to them on the earth.

And you can imagine that temples don't exist alone; if there were a hundred temples, there must have been a city of thousands of people; otherwise a hundred temples are meaningless. Where are those people? With the temples those people have been massacred.

And those temples I take as an example, because their sculpture will look pornographic to the Western mind; to Mahatma Gandhi it also looked pornographic.

India owes so much to Rabindranath Tagore. He was the man who prevented Mahatma Gandhi and other politicians who were ready to cover the temples, to hide them from people's eyes. Rabindranath Tagore said, "This is absolutely stupid. They are not pornographic, they are utterly beautiful."

There is a very delicate line between pornography and beauty. A naked woman is not necessarily pornographic; a naked man is not necessarily pornographic. A beautiful man, a beautiful woman, naked, can be examples of beauty, of health, of proportion. They are the most glorious

products of nature. If a deer can be naked and beautiful -- and nobody thinks the deer is pornographic -- then why should it be that a naked man or woman cannot be just seen as beautiful?

There were ladies in the times of Victoria in England, who covered the legs of the chairs with cloth because legs should not be left naked -- chairs' legs! But because they are called legs, it was thought uncivilized, uncultured, to leave them naked. There was a movement in Victoria's time that the people who take their dogs for a walk should cover them with cloth. They should not be naked... as if nakedness itself is pornographic. It is the pornographic mind.

I have been to Khajuraho hundreds of times, and I have not seen a single sculpture as pornographic. A naked picture or a naked statue becomes pornography if it provokes your sexuality. That's the only criterion: if it provokes your sexuality, if it is an incentive to your sexual instinct. But that is not the case with Khajuraho. In fact the temples were made for just the opposite purpose.

They were made to meditate on man and woman making love. And the stones have come alive. The people who have made them must have been the greatest artists the world has known. They were made to meditate upon, they were objects for meditation.

It is a temple, and meditators were sitting around just looking at the sculptures, and watching within themselves whether there was any sexual desire arising. This was the criterion: when they found there was no sexual desire arising, it was a certificate for them to enter the temples.

All these sculptures are outside the temple, on the walls outside; inside there are no nudist statues.
But this was necessary for people to meditate, and then they were clear that there was no desire; on the contrary those statues had made their ordinary desire for sex subside. Then they were capable of entering into the temple; otherwise they should not enter the temple. That would be a profanity -- having such a desire inside and entering the temple. It would be making the temple dirty -- you would be insulting the temple.
The people who created these temples created a tremendous, voluminous literature also. The East never used to be repressive of sexuality. Before Buddha and Mahavira the East was never repressive of sexuality. It was with Buddha and Mahavira that for the first time celibacy became spiritual. Otherwise, before Buddha and Mahavira, all the seers of the UPANISHADS, of the VEDAS, were married people; they were not celibate, they had children. And they were not people who had renounced the world; they had all the luxuries and all the comforts. They lived in the forests, but they had everything presented to them by their students, by the kings, by their lovers. And their ashramas, their schools, their academies in the forest were very affluent.
With Buddha and Mahavira the East began a sick tradition of celibacy, of repression. And when Christianity came into India, there came a very strong trend of repressiveness. These three hundred years of Christianity have made the Eastern mind almost as repressive as the Western mind.
So now my methods are applicable to both. I call them preliminary methods. They are to destroy everything that

can prevent you from going into a silent meditation. Once dynamic meditation or kundalini meditation succeeds, you are clean. You have erased repressiveness. You have erased the speediness, the hurry, the impatience. Now it is possible for you to enter the temple.

It is for this reason that I spoke about the acceptance of sex, because without the acceptance of sex, you cannot get rid of repression. And I want you to be completely clean, natural. I want you to be in a state where those one hundred and twelve methods can be applicable to you.

This is my reason for devising these methods -- these are simply cleansing methods.

I have also included the Western therapeutic methods because the Western mind -- and under its influence, the Eastern mind: both have become sick. It is a rare phenomenon today to find a healthy mind. Everybody is feeling a certain kind of nausea, a mental nausea, a certain emptiness, which is like a wound hurting. Everybody is having his life turned into a nightmare. Everybody is worried, too much afraid of death; not only afraid of death but also afraid of life.

People are living half-heartedly, people are living in a lukewarm way: not intensely like Zorba the Greek, not with a healthy flavor but with a sick mind. One has to live, so they are living. One has to love, so they are loving. One has to do this, to be like this, so they are following; otherwise there is no incentive coming from their own being.

They are not overflowing with energy. They are not risking anything to live totally. They are not adventurous -- and without being adventurous, one is not healthy. Adventure is the criterion, inquiry into the unknown is the criterion.

People are not young, from childhood they simply become old. Youth never happens.
The Western therapeutic methods cannot help you to grow spiritually, but they can prepare the ground. They cannot sow the seeds of flowers but they can prepare the ground -- which is a necessity. This was one reason why I included therapies.
There is also another reason: I want a meeting of East and West.
The East has developed meditative methods; the West has not developed meditative methods, the West has developed psychotherapies. If we want the Western mind to be interested in meditation methods, if you want the Eastern mind to come closer to the Western, then there has to be something of give and take. It should not be just Eastern -- something from the Western evolution should be included. And I find those therapies are immensely helpful. They can't go far, but as far as they go, it is good. Where they stop, meditations can take over.
But the Western mind should feel that something of its own development has been included in the meeting, in the merger; it should not be one-sided. And they are significant; they cannot harm, they can only help.
And I have used them for the last fifteen years with tremendous success. They have helped people to cleanse their beings, prepared them to be ready to enter into the temple of meditation. My effort is to dissolve the separation between East and West. The earth should be one, not only politically but spiritually too.
And you say that people think that this is a clever way of brainwashing. It is something more: it is mindwashing, not

brainwashing. Brainwashing is very superficial. The brain is the mechanism that the mind uses. You can wash the brain very easily -- just any mechanism can be washed and cleaned and lubricated. But if the mind which is behind the brain is polluted, is dirty, is full of repressed desires, is full of ugliness, soon the brain will be full of all those ugly things.

And I don't see that there is anything wrong in it -- washing is always good. I believe in dry-cleaning. I don't use old methods of washing.

And yes, people will feel cheated that their mind has been taken away, and that was the only precious thing they had. This will be only in the beginning. Once the mind is taken away, they will be surprised that behind the mind is their real treasure. And the mind was only a mirror, it was reflecting the treasure, but it had no treasure in itself. The treasure is behind the mind -- that is your being.

But a mirror can deceive you. It can give you the idea that what is reflected in it is a reality. So unless the mind is taken away -- and that's what meditation is, it is a state of no-mind. It is taking away the mind and giving you a chance to see not the reflection of the treasure of your being, but the treasure itself.

It is at this point that the master becomes a tremendous help, because to lose the mind is the most difficult thing. I can understand, because that is the only thing you have, and to lose it means to lose all. And we know when somebody loses his mind he goes mad. So everybody clings to the mind -- nobody wants to go mad.

It is here the master is a practical necessity, because you have a person who has lost his mind and yet is not mad. In

fact by losing his mind he has become the sanest person possible.

This is the moment when you need encouragement to take a jump, to risk it all. This is the moment when you need somebody you love and somebody who loves you, and somebody whose love is more precious than your mind, so that for his love's sake you can lose your mind.

And love is something that people can give their whole life for, what to say about their mind. If you love someone you can give your whole life -- you can die for your love. So the mind is nothing. And the master grows the seeds of love slowly, slowly -- seeds of trust. He will not do anything unless he feels the time is ripe; unless he sees that the time is ripe and your love is capable, has come of age, and it can be asked to throw the mind away.

It can happen very easily in love and trust. And when you have a living example before you and you have lived with the master for years and seen him in different situations, seen him from different perspectives -- and always found him the same unflickering light, the same joy, without any change -- then deep down in your heart love and trust go on growing.

And finally, when the heart is so strong with love and trust, you can risk the mind. It is not more valuable than your heart. And the moment you drop the mind, suddenly you open the doors of the real treasure. That's what you have been seeking all your life, but the mind was a barrier.

Question 2

BELOVED OSHO,

IS THAT TRUE THAT YOU HAVE DECLARED YOUR THERAPISTS TO BE THE BEST IN THE WORLD? AND WHAT MAKES THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THEM AND THE FAMOUS THERAPISTS OF THE ESALEN INSTITUTE?

Yes, my therapists are the best in the world, for the simple reason that other therapists are only therapists, they are not meditators. My therapists are meditators too.

Therapy is a superficial thing. It can help to clean the ground, but just to have a clean ground is not to have a garden.

You will need something more. Therapy is negative; it simply takes away the weeds from the ground, removes the stones from the ground, prepares the soil for the garden. But there its work ends.

Western therapy is still in its very primitive stage. It has to go a long way. And unless it becomes associated with meditation, it may help a little bit superficially but it cannot really help the person to grow.

And it takes so much time. There are people who have been in psychoanalysis or in other therapies for ten years, twelve years. They have been changing therapists, but their problems remain the same. They have been digging deep in their dreams; they have been finding new analysts -- Freudian, Jungian, Adlerian, Assagiolian -- and those explanations seem significant for a moment. But they don't change anything. In fact people become addicted to therapy.

It has become a luxury in the West... just as in the old days women used to talk about each other's clothes, their

diamonds, their paintings, the decorations of their house, and how much it cost; now ladies are talking about who their psychoanalyst is, and how much one session costs. It has become something to be proud of that you have the best, the most expensive psychoanalyst in the world, and you have had him for ten years.

And you have to look at one thing: the people practicing psychoanalysis and other concerned professions of therapy, these people themselves are not healthy. They know the technique, they have learned the technique, but they themselves are not healthy people -- healthy in the sense that they have any integrity. Twice the number of psychotherapists go mad than any other profession. And twice the number of psychoanalysts commit suicide than any other profession.

This is very strange... because these people should not go mad and should not commit suicide; otherwise how are these people going to help others?

Not a single meditator has committed suicide down the ages. You cannot think of Gautam Buddha committing suicide. You cannot think of Bodhidharma going mad. It is simply inconceivable. So something very fundamental is missing.

So when I say my therapists are the best in the world, I simply mean that my therapists are not only therapists, they are meditators too. Other therapists are only therapists. If you look into their lives you will be surprised: you will find what I am saying.

Sigmund Freud, the founder of psychoanalysis, was so much afraid of ghosts that you cannot believe it. You cannot say this man was mature: he was retarded. He was

so much afraid of ghosts that even at the word "ghost" he went into a fit, fell from his chair, and started foaming from the mouth. And this is the founder of psychoanalysis!
Carl Gustav Jung was going to be his successor -- Freud himself had chosen him -- and he was a man of great intellectual possibilities. But he was too interested in ghosts -- that was the reason he was thrown out of the psychoanalytic movement. Freud tried to prevent his talking about ghosts. He said, "Don't bring up that subject." He could not even mention the name of the subject -- "that subject." But Jung was so interested that once in a while he would bring up the subject and the whole scene would be repeated.
Finally it was thought that Jung should be removed from the movement, and he was expelled. But he himself was not in a better position. He wanted to go to Egypt to see the old mummies of ancient queens and pharaos -- three thousand years old, four thousand years old. He was very much interested in how they were preserved, how they looked. He was interested in death -- that's why he was interested in ghosts.
On the one hand he was interested in the mummies, and on the other hand he was afraid. It happens always: things you are very much fascinated with, you are also afraid of -- because too much fascination means you are getting caught in something which may prove beyond your capacities, and you may end up in something you never wanted.
Ten times Jung booked a ticket to go to Egypt, and every time he would find some excuse not to go. He would fall sick, he would have a fever, and the ticket had to be canceled. And he knew perfectly well -- he was a very keen

observer -- he knew perfectly well, "Why does it happen only when I book a ticket? Otherwise I am perfectly healthy -- no fever, nothing. As the time comes closer, when I have to leave the next day, I cannot sleep the whole night, and in the morning I have fever. Just an excuse so nobody can say that I am postponing it."

But he became aware, "It is me," so the tenth time he said, "Whatever happens, I am going to go." He went to the airport, had a nervous breakdown, and was brought back home. Then he dropped the idea of going to Egypt.

Now, are these people going to help? And these are the greatest names.

I say my therapists are better than Freud and Jung and Adler for the simple reason that they are not only therapists, they are meditators. And they do not have such hang-ups, such idiotic ideas in their minds. For that, the meditations I have devised are enough: they will cathart all these ideas. For example, if Freud had done Dynamic Meditation, I can guarantee it: his ghosts would not have had any power over him.

By the way, it happened that I used to live outside Jabalpur, near a graveyard of Mohammedans. Mohammedans believe that when a man dies, his soul remains in the grave till the last judgment day. Then God will come and wake up all the souls from all the graveyards and decide who is good and who is bad.

I had found a house just near the graveyard for the simple reason that the house was very beautiful and nobody was ready to purchase it or rent it -- because people were afraid of the graveyard. So many souls are there, so many ghosts!

The bungalow that I had rented was called a ghost bungalow.

I approached the owner; he said, "If you simply live there, there is no need for any rent. Just take care of my bungalow, because it has not been maintained. I have put so much money into it, but I had never thought that this graveyard would create trouble."

So he gave me the bungalow free. I started Dynamic Meditation, and it was the right place because no neighbors, only ghosts! So nobody was disturbed. But I was surprised: after two or three days, a group of Mohammedans with a Maulvi -- a Mohammedan priest -- reached me and they said, "You cannot do this Dynamic Meditation here."

I said, "What is the problem? -- because here is no neighbor, nobody is disturbed. You don't live here."

One said, "It is not a question of neighbors -- you are disturbing our graveyard! And the way you do Dynamic Meditation, the souls may escape from the grave. Then at the last judgment day how is God going to find them?"

I said, "This is really a problem! I have never thought about it, that Dynamic Meditation would frighten the ghosts and they would escape from their bodies and the graveyard, and God would have difficulty finding where they had gone...."

So I had to stop because they were very angry.

They said, "It is a religious question, and it is not one soul -- so many souls. And from where have you got this Dynamic Meditation? We have never heard about it. It can wake up any sleeping soul."

I said, "It is true -- it can wake up!"

If Sigmund Freud had done Dynamic Meditation he would have dropped his sickness. If Jung had done it, he would have dropped his sickness. They are good people, but they are doing only half the work -- and the remaining half is far more important. They simply clean the ground and wait for the garden to happen. It never happens: then they get frustrated.

You will be surprised to know that Sigmund Freud never went through psychoanalysis -- his own method. His disciples were insisting, "You should go through psychoanalysis. We are trained, you have trained us -- now you can choose anybody you like and he will psychoanalyze you."

But Freud refused point-blank. Why was he so afraid? And if the founder himself is afraid of going into psychoanalysis, it has great meaning. It means he knew that his dreams will reveal all that he has been condemning. His dreams will show that he is carrying in his heart all that he is telling other people -- that they are repressing sex. His dreams will show that he himself is repressing sex.

He never agreed: the founder of psychoanalysis was never analyzed. Now, this is strange. It is as if the founder of vipassana -- Gautam Buddha -- never did vipassana. And if he never did vipassana, what right would he have to say to others, "You do it and it will be good for you."

First one has to experiment on oneself, and unless one finds that it works, and works for the better, one has no right to say to anyone, "Do it."

So I repeat: my therapists are the best in the world. And any therapist in the West, if he wants to become a real therapist, has to come to me. He has to come to

meditations, and he has to create a synthesis between therapy and meditation. Then only will he be a real therapist; otherwise he is just doing half a job -- which is very dangerous.
It is like doing partial surgery on a person and leaving him with an open wound. It would have been better if you had not touched him. If you have opened his wound, it is better you do it completely. And that's what is happening in the West: the psychotherapists and other therapists are opening people's wounds and leaving them incomplete. They are creating a very dangerous situation for the person. He will find himself in more anguish than he had ever been.
Now is the time that psychoanalysis should come to meet with meditative methods. East and West, unless they meet and merge with each other, will remain half and half. They are not complete in themselves. Together they can be complete -- and completion of anything has a beauty of its own.

Light on the Path

Chapter #17

Chapter title: No-mind is emptiness and fullness together
18 January 1986 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
ONCE YOU DESCRIBED YOUR WORK AS A SEARCH FOR THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THE BUDDHAS. YOU EXPLAINED THAT FREUD

ESTABLISHED ONLY A PSYCHOLOGY OF PATHOLOGY. THEN CAME MASLOV, JANOV, ASSAGIOLI, PERLS AND THE PEOPLE WHO ELABORATED ON THE PSYCHOLOGY OF HEALTH. YOU ADDED THAT YOUR WORK WAS GOING FURTHER -- TRYING TO ESTABLISH A PSYCHOLOGY OF THE AWAKENED ONE, A PSYCHOLOGY OF THE BUDDHAS. YOU SAID THAT YOU WERE STUDYING US IN ORDER TO FIND OUT WHICH ARE THE DIFFICULTIES THAT A SEEKER FINDS ON THE PATH TOWARDS THE REALIZATION OF THE SELF, TOWARDS HIS OWN AWAKENING. NOW, YOU'VE BEEN STUDYING US FOR FIFTEEN YEARS, AND I WOULD LIKE YOU TO GIVE US SOME HINTS ON WHAT YOU FIND IN YOUR LIVING EXPERIMENT.

The first thing: all the psychologies are of the mind. The psychology of the Buddhas will be of the no-mind. It is going to be diametrically opposite to the ordinary psychologies in every aspect, in every direction, because it is a totally new dimension -- never touched before, never even thought about before.

It is easy to study the mind. It is very difficult, almost impossible, to study the no-mind.

The no-mind reminds me of a modern painting.

One modern painter was exhibiting his works of art. A man was standing before a painting for almost half an hour. The painter was moving around the exhibition, explaining to people when they had any questions about a painting.

This man was absolutely absorbed by the painting, and the painter came many times, but felt it was not right to disturb him. But finally he had to, because the painting was nothing but an empty canvas. He asked the man, "Are you interested in the painting?"

The man said, "I am certainly interested, because I am wondering, where is the painting? It is an empty canvas, but if it is being exhibited there must be a painting, somewhere, in some way. Are you the painter?"

The man said, "Yes, I am the painter and I am here to explain it to you: this is a painting of a cow eating grass."

There was no cow and there was no grass. The man said, "But I don't see the cow."

The painter said, "She has eaten and gone home."

The man said, "But I don't even see the grass!"

The painter said, "The cow has eaten the grass and gone home, so there is no cow and no grass. That's why I have left the canvas empty."

The study of no-mind is just the study of an empty canvas. The thoughts are gone, the emotions are gone, the sentiments are gone, the moods are gone. Nothing is left except a pure, empty space.

So we have to study this empty space in a different way than we study the ordinary mind -- because the ordinary mind has contents, and this empty space has no content. It has a certain quality, but it has no content. It has a certain fragrance, but it has no content. There is nothing objective; it is pure subjectivity.

All scientific studies are objective; they need something to study. In this empty space there is no object; you don't have

anything to study. So a new dimension has to be explored with totally different approaches.

So first, let me say a few things about ordinary psychology -- what it has discovered, where it is -- because that will help you to understand the emptiness, the spaciousness of the no-mind.

Sigmund Freud was the first man in the West who came to discover the unconscious mind. In the East it has been known for centuries, so it was not a discovery -- Sigmund Freud was just not aware that it had been discovered long before. He is not really the founder. It was discovered so long ago that we don't even know the name of the person who discovered the unconscious mind.

Freud came to the unconscious mind via dreams. He found that people say things when they are awake which are not true: they say things which they are supposed to say, they behave the way they are expected to behave. They are not sincere, they are not authentic. Their whole conscious mind is hypocritical -- because for centuries they have been told how to be, what to say, what to do, what is respectable; their conscious mind has been conditioned by the centuries. Listening to them you cannot discover the real content of their being. You can simply reach to the surface of their mask, but not to their original face. Because the person says one thing but does another, he's continuously lying -- and each lie needs more lies to protect it.

That gave Freud some idea that it would be better, perhaps.... Man cannot deceive in his dreams because he has no control over dreams, and the conditioning of the society has not reached to his dreams.

You may see a beautiful woman, and you may behave like a perfect gentleman with her, but that is not your truth. In a dream you can rape the woman, you can make love to the woman. You will not bother that she is not your wife, because dreams don't believe in your social codes and mores and behavior patterns.

Dreams don't know that marriages exist. Dreams are not aware that the woman is not yours, she is somebody else's wife. In a dream you simply do what you feel like doing -- you are true. That's why Freud started studying the dreams of people.

And he was surprised that dreams contain tremendous treasures to help to understand the real man, to take away his mask and to see something real.

But there is a difficulty with dreams -- they are pictorial. The conscious mind is linguistic. The conscious mind is educated, cultured, civilized; the unconscious mind, in sleep, is primitive. Civilization has not touched it at all. And who cares what you dream? You may murder somebody, you cannot be caught for the crime....

Only in one society, a small aboriginal commune in Thailand... of which Sigmund Freud was not aware, otherwise his theories about dreams would have been different.

For centuries that tribe has accepted dreams as part of reality. If you misbehave in your dream, in the morning you have to go the person you misbehaved with, and you have to make an apology. You have to bring fruits and sweets to offer him, and say to him how nasty you have been in your dream: "Please forgive me. Until you forgive me, I will not be able to feel right again." Naturally, he is forgiven,

because the person has not been harmed, he knows nothing about your dream.

But that is the only society in the whole world which takes dreams seriously, as being almost parallel to reality. And everything that happens in the dream has to be told to the elders of the society the first thing in the morning, whatever it is. You may have raped a woman -- you have to say it. You have to say who is the woman, and you have to apologize to the woman, to her husband, to the family. Strangely enough, this is the only tribe in the whole world which dreams very rarely -- because they don't repress their dreams. On the contrary, they express them and they settle them, so nothing remains hanging. They have done whatever they could do; they have offered an apology, they have presented some gift, whatsoever they could manage, and they have been forgiven. The dream thing is settled -- that dream is finished. So it is very rare in that community for people to dream, very rarely will a person dream.

But in Western society where Sigmund Freud was working, out of eight hours of sleeping, you are dreaming six hours. Only for two hours here and there are you not dreaming. Six hours is a lot of time -- and dreams have their own chronology, so in six hours you can dream of sixty years. In six hours you can manage to dream as much as you want. Dreaming does not follow the same time scale.

So sometimes it may happen that you have just fallen asleep for a few seconds, and you are awakened by some noise or something. And you wonder that only a few seconds have passed on your watch but you had such a long dream -- in a few seconds such a long dream is not possible.

It is possible because the dream does not follow the same time scale. So in six hours you are going through so much garbage, and that garbage is accumulated by our repressions.

That aboriginal community in Thailand has no repression. Even the dream has to be given expression, so you are free of it. It is psychologically healthy. Nobody has ever gone mad in that community. Nobody has ever murdered anybody in that community. Nobody has ever committed suicide in that community.

And the last and the most emphatic thing to remember is that that is the only community in the whole of history which has never fought a war. It does not know that wars exist.

Perhaps wars have something to do with your repressions. After each ten, twenty years the whole humanity is so full of repressions that a great explosion into a war is an absolute necessity; otherwise you all will go mad. War is a civilized way to go mad and yet retain the idea that you are sane.

Listening to people's dreams, Freud came to see that people are living an absolutely false life. And this false life is created by your religions, by your moralities, by your educational system. They have not given you any method of transformation -- they have simply given you a false face to cover your original face.

In dreams people are doing all kinds of things. They are embarrassed, when they are awake, even to accept what they did in their dreams. So Freud discovered a layer within and below the conscious mind -- he called it the unconscious mind, because you are not aware of it. And his

whole life's work was concerned with how to sort out dreams and how to make those dreams conscious.

It is one of the great findings of Freud that once a dream becomes conscious it loses its grip on you; hence psychoanalysis became of great importance. Nothing else has to be done; the dream just has to be brought fully to the conscious mind.

You have to accept in all its minute details, that it is your dream, that you are carrying such thoughts within you. You should not deny it. If you deny it, it will remain within you. If you accept it, it evaporates.

The idea is that if all the dreams evaporate, your unconscious becomes clean, without garbage; and that gives you a tremendous feeling of well-being. You are not carrying something against yourself. You are not creating a division between your conscious mind and the unconscious mind; you are no longer split.

When there is no dream left -- which Sigmund Freud did not succeed in doing.... He helped people to lessen the quantity of dreams, but he was not able, even with a single patient, to make him completely free of dreams.

So there is not a single person in the whole world who is fully psychoanalyzed. There are people who have been in psychoanalysis for fifteen years or twenty years, and still they go on digging and more and more rubbish goes on coming.

This was the reason why Carl Gustav Jung got an idea that perhaps below the unconscious mind there is another mind which goes on supplying more and more dreams. You go on analyzing, dispersing, but something keeps welling up

and the unconscious is never clear, never clean; hence he came to the idea of the collective unconscious.

The idea of the collective unconscious is very important. It means that there is a point in your mind where you are connected with all the minds around you. This mind is collective, it is not just your own.

And there is constant traffic within the collective mind: so you may get rid of dreams in your unconscious mind, but the collective mind goes on supplying more and more junk. And the collective mind is like a continent. Everybody else is involved in it; not only the present people, but centuries that have passed and the people who have lived -- all have left impressions on the collective unconscious.

There is a possibility Jung never explored -- that perhaps the collective unconscious has something to do with Charles Darwin's theory of evolution. Perhaps you are carrying the collective unconscious mind of many lives... since the first life was born in the ocean as a fish and then developed through many forms up to the ape, and from ape to man. All those memories are there.

Somebody has to work with the collective mind through Charles Darwin's approach. And that will also give a tremendous insight into Eastern religions and their idea of rebirth -- that you had many births before, and not necessarily only human. You have been in other forms of life.

Gautam Buddha says in one of his lives he was an elephant, and he relates many stories of his past lives in which he was different animals. Perhaps all three -- Carl Gustav Jung, Charles Darwin, and the Eastern idea of rebirth -- are

significant as far as the collective mind, the collective unconscious, is concerned.

And it is so full: from so many dimensions so many rivers are filling it; it is oceanic. And unless it is cleaned, you can never have a clean unconscious mind because this collective mind will go on supplying new stuff.

Jung stopped at the collective unconscious. The East has not stopped there. The East has these ideas -- the unconscious mind, the collective unconscious mind -- and it has one more mind, the deepest, the very base: it can be called the cosmic collective unconscious.

It is not only concerned with life, it is concerned with existence itself. There, the whole existence is supporting you. The whole existence is giving energy to the collective unconscious, which is a smaller thing; and the collective unconscious is giving to the unconscious, which is smaller still.

But this is all in darkness. Western psychology has gone only into the darker part of the mind, and in that too it has not reached yet to the cosmic unconscious.

This is going below, into the basement. The Eastern psychology has a similar pattern above the conscious mind. Just as there is an unconscious mind below the conscious mind, above the conscious mind there is a superconscious mind. Western psychology has not even dreamed about it. Above the superconscious mind there is the collective superconscious mind, and above that there is the cosmic superconscious mind. It seems very logical, and very mathematical that if there is a basement, a foundation in the dark, then there must be something above. Things are always balanced in nature.

If a tree has roots and you only study the roots and forget the tree, you will be utterly wrong. The roots go downwards, deeper and deeper in the darkness; the tree goes upwards. It is strange that the roots go downwards and the tree goes upwards -- in different directions.

At a certain point where the roots and the tree join there is a meeting point, and a departure point too. You have to learn about the tree, its foliage, its flowers, its fruits; otherwise just studying the roots will be incomplete. Unless you know the tree too, you will not understand the meaning of the roots.

The meaning of the roots is in the flowers, it is not there in the roots themselves.

Just as through dreams Freud reached to the unconscious mind, through meditation man can reach to the superconscious mind. And as meditation deepens he can reach to the collective superconscious mind -- which joins us again, but on a conscious level. At the highest point of meditation you reach to the cosmic superconscious. That joins you with the whole cosmos.

But as you are going higher you are losing your ego. With the cosmic superconscious mind you are, but you are no more an ego. Nothing separates you from the whole.

This is the point where Al-Hillaj-Mansoor said, ana'l haq: I am God, myself. Or the Upanishads say, aham brahmasmi: I am the whole. I am the ultimate. I am the absolute. The emphasis is not on the "I", the emphasis is on the absolute, the ultimate. The "I" has to be used only because of the language.

These are the seven stages of the mind: three below the conscious mind and three above the conscious mind. Only

one thing remains which is beyond all these, and that is the state of no-mind. That comes only when you become an observer of the superconscious, of the collective superconscious, of the cosmic superconscious. You are simply a witness.

Things are becoming more and more beautiful, more and more majestic, miraculous -- there is every danger you may be lost. You may become too attached to the beauties that you are coming across.

Here again, I remind you that the master is a need: to push you, to tell you that this is nothing, there is something more ahead.

When you become a witness of the cosmic superconscious mind, mind disappears with all its seven forms. The whole tree disappears as if it had never existed, and there is pure space. This pure space is not empty. It is full, overfull with all the potentialities. It is the very source of all creation. Everything has come out of it and one day will go back into it.

Buddha has called it nothingness. That word "nothingness" gives a certain negative color. It is better to call it pure space, which is natural. It does not give you any idea of the negative or of the positive, just spaciousness.

I will tell you two stories. One is a Sufi story of a mystic who used to see a woodcutter going to the forest every day. The woodcutter was old, very old, but there was no other way: he had no son, no family, all had died. He had survived longer than he needed to. Just for his needs he had to continue to cut wood and sell it.

He always came to the mystic to touch his feet and go into the forest, and in the evening he would return with the load.

It was really heavy for him, and every day it was becoming more and more difficult.

One day the mystic said, "Wait! You have become too old, and now this work is not for you. I will show you a simpler way. Today don't cut the wood, just go a little farther, and soon you will come to a mine of copper. Collect some copper, and that will give you enough money to live at least for seven days; you need not come again for seven days. So once a week you can come and collect copper."

The man went, found the mine, and thanked the mystic. He was immensely happy because the burden was too much, and he was becoming so ancient, weak, old, and he could not see well.

After a few days the mystic said, "You are a strange man! I was thinking that finding the copper mine you would think -- you would become curious to go a little farther.... Perhaps there is something more. But it seems you have lost all curiosity, all adventurousness.

"So I have to say to you again, go a little further and you will find a silver mine. You can collect silver, and that will be enough for a whole month. No need to come every week, you are getting too old, once a month you can come."

The man went ahead, found the silver, thanked the mystic and said, "Your compassion and grace is so great, I cannot repay it in any way. I am a poor old man."

The mystic said, "Don't be worried about it. Just remain curious about finding something more."

The old man said, "What? Is there more, too? But this is enough -- once a month."

The mystic said, "No. If you go ahead you will find a gold mine. That will suffice for the whole year."
Next day the man came, and he went and found the gold. But the mystic said, "My life is going to come to an end. I will not always be here to tell you to go ahead. So I should rather tell you now not to stop at the gold, because just a little further there is a diamond mine. And that will suffice not only for you, but for a few of your relatives and friends. You can feed the whole neighborhood. But don't stop there."
The woodcutter said, "But what can be worth more than diamonds?"
The mystic said, "Can't you see me sitting here? There must be something more than diamonds; otherwise I would not be sitting here, I would be simply carrying diamonds to the market. Don't you want to reach where I have reached? It is beyond the diamonds, just a little further."
The poor woodcutter could not understand -- what can be more than diamonds? But he went a little further, and he was surprised: he found the same mystic sitting under a tree!
The mystic said, "So you have come! Now there is no need to go back. You can also sit under the tree."
In Eastern mythology there is a tree called kalpavriksha. If you sit under that tree, whatever you desire is fulfilled immediately. It is a symbol. It is a symbol of the contented mind, that really never desires anything so there is no question of discontent.
The old man sat with the master and was surprised that he had no desire, that he did not want anything -- diamonds,

gold, silver, nothing -- that all was fulfilled, that suddenly he had come to a place where nothing was needed.
The mystic said, "How does it feel?"
The woodcutter said, "But you are a tricky man! Why did you not say it in the beginning? Why did you make me go from one place to another, from one mine to another?"
The mystic said, "If I had told you in the beginning you would not have believed me. It was to create trust. Because I proved trustworthy about the copper, the silver, the gold, the diamonds -- that's why you have been able to follow my instruction to go further. Otherwise, everybody argues, `What can there be beyond diamonds?'
"You trusted: `If the man is right up to diamonds, there must be something more. And if he is saying so, I am going.' This is the same tree I have always been sitting under. I could have told you anytime but you would not have listened."
This is the first story; to remind you that man has to move through meditation from consciousness to superconsciousness, from superconsciousness to collective superconsciousness, from collective superconsciousness to cosmic superconsciousness. And then only can the master persuade him to take a jump.
And the master has been right up to now -- your distrust has melted away. And if he says, "Walk on," you will take the risk. The trust is now deep enough that you can jump into pure space.
That is no-mind. And to attain to no-mind is to attain all. There is nothing more than that, because it is peace, it is silence, it is blissfulness. It is godliness, it is immortality, it is eternity. No-mind is all that is possible.

The other story that I wanted to tell is about a very rich man who had three sons and was puzzled about whom to make his successor. They were all intelligent, and that was making the choice more difficult. Each was more intelligent than the other.

He asked a visiting mystic, "What should I do?" And the mystic gave him a device: The rich man gave to each of his sons a bag full of golden coins and told them, "Within seven days you have to fill your houses completely with whatsoever you want to purchase with this money. But the houses should be full. And whoever succeeds in filling the houses totally will be my successor, so be careful!"

They all had their palaces and they were very much worried because with such a small amount of money.... Their palaces were big: how were they going to fill them?

The first son thought that the cheapest thing would be just to go to the municipal corporation and ask them, "Bring all your trucks that throw out the rubbish and fill my house -- I will pay you money for it."

It cost nothing, and they had to throw the garbage away somewhere anyway, so the first son filled his house with all kinds of rubbish, not leaving a small spot empty. But it was stinking so badly that even on the road the traffic stopped. People would not move on that road because the house was stinking so badly.

The second son thought, "This is stupid! What my brother has done, my father is not going to like." He had to find something better, but with a small amount of money how can you find something better? But he worked it out: he brought beautiful candles, and the day his father was to

come, the son put all the candles in the house and the house was full of light.

The third son looked at the two brothers: the first was certainly stupid; the second was far superior. But there is a strange thing about candles or lamps: whatever you do... they will spread light all over, but just underneath them there will be darkness. That darkness remains without light -- that is empty. Something better had to be found....

The day came when the father arrived with the mystic. In the first house they could not enter. They said to the first son, "You are a super idiot, you are just mad! If this is the way of your thinking, then your whole life you will collect rubbish, and your whole life will stink like this palace. A marble palace, and you have filled it with all kinds of rubbish, rotten things! I cannot even enter your house. You have lost."

The father entered the second house. He could not figure things out, because it was empty. There was just light but the house was empty. He asked the mystic, "What is the matter with my second son? -- he has not filled it."

The mystic said, "He has filled it. Now you need a little more intelligence to understand: he has filled it with light -- the whole house is full. But he is not going to be your successor either, because under each candle there is a spot which is dark; the condition is not completed.

"Although he is far more intelligent than the first one, he has missed, missed by just a little miscalculation. He has not looked under the candles and seen that there is darkness. The whole house is not full of light." They told the son, and he understood: it was right.

They reached the third house. There was no light, it was dark. As they entered, the third son returned the money. He said, "I can fill the house without wasting the money. I have filled it with darkness. It is completely full, not a single corner is empty. And I have filled it with something which is eternal."

Light comes and goes -- darkness always remains. Light needs fuel; if the fuel is exhausted the light is finished. Darkness is the only thing that needs no cause -- it is not an effect of any cause, so you cannot destroy it. It is always there -- when the sun rises and there is light all over, darkness is still there. It is just that you cannot see because the sun covers it, distracts your eyes. It does not destroy darkness. The moment the sun goes down, suddenly the darkness is there. It does not go, it does not come; it is always there.

"So you can take the money back -- I don't need it, I can manage it without wasting money."

The house was full of silence, full of space, full of darkness, full of depth, full of mystery -- and in a way completely empty. He had removed everything from the house, all furniture, everything. The whole house was empty, and yet full.

I wanted to tell this story because the ultimate state of no-mind is both, empty and full. Because of its being empty, Gautam Buddha called it nothingness. Because of its fullness, the UPANISHADS have called it the ultimate, the absolute. But both are saying only half the story. I would like to say the whole story.

It is emptiness and fullness together. It transcends all logic. It is sheer transcendence of all duality.

The state of no-mind is the psychology of the Buddhas. And only a man who has tasted the state of no-mind is really sane, is really healthy and whole. Others are different only in degree from an insane person; there is no qualitative difference. Somebody who is sane today may become insane tomorrow.

In fact most of the psychologists have been insane once or twice in their life. Most of the Western artists have been insane some time or other. Great musicians, great sculptors, great dancers -- wherever there is greatness, somehow insanity comes in.

It is very strange: it has never happened in the East, but it has happened in the West, and it is happening every day in the West.

Nijinsky, one of the greatest dancers of all the ages, died in a madhouse. Vincent van Gogh, in the last year of his life, was in a madhouse, and just after he was released he committed suicide. And the same is the story of great philosophers.

It seems the greatness somehow makes them unbalanced. One part goes on becoming great, and their whole mind lags far behind. They are stretched by the tension between their whole mind dragging them backwards, and just one small part dragging them forwards. It creates a situation which leads to madness.

It has never happened in the East. No dancer has ever gone mad, no musician has ever gone mad. On the contrary, it is a well-established fact that if a madman is brought to a great musician -- just listening to his music, his madness disappears. Just the music is such a solace, so harmonious,

that something that is disturbed in him settles -- just listening to it.
No man who has been meditating has ever committed suicide, has ever gone mad, for the simple reason that he is going towards more balance, towards more inner harmony, and finally towards absolute harmony -- that is the harmony of no-mind.
We have to bring the psychology of the Buddhas to the world. It is the whole psychology. All the seven-storied house of mind has to be transcended.
Western psychology is still wandering around the roots. It has not even touched the foliage, the flowers, the fruits. There is no question of it going into no-mind -- it has not even been able to take note of the whole mind. And without knowing the whole mind you cannot jump into the no-mind.
No-mind is realization.
No-mind is enlightenment.
No-mind is liberation.

Light on the Path
Chapter #18
Chapter title: The mind is a deceiver
19 January 1986 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
I LOVED THE INTRODUCTION ABOUT THE PSYCHOLOGICAL UNIVERSE THAT YOU GAVE ME

YESTERDAY. AND YET I WOULD LIKE TO REPEAT THE QUESTION.
YOU SAY THAT YOU WERE STUDYING US IN ORDER TO FIND OUT WHICH ARE THE DIFFICULTIES THAT THE SEEKER FINDS ON THE PATH TOWARDS REALIZATION OF THE SELF, TOWARDS HIS OWN AWAKENING. NOW YOU HAVE BEEN STUDYING US FOR FIFTEEN YEARS, AND I WOULD LIKE YOU TO GIVE US SOME HINTS ON WHAT YOU FIND IN YOUR LIVING EXPERIMENT. OR, IN OTHER WORDS, WHAT ARE THE PATTERNS THE SEEKER GETS MOST ENTANGLED IN, AND WHAT IS THE FUNCTION OF THE MASTER IN THAT?

There are patterns the seeker gets entangled with.
The first thing is: most of the seekers are lost in an illusory feeling that they have arrived. It is a kind of dream in which you feel you are awake. You are still dreaming -- your feeling of being awake is part of the dream.
The same kind of thing happens to the seeker. The mind is capable of creating the illusion that now there is nowhere to go, you have arrived. The mind is a deceiver, and the function of the master in this condition is to make you alert that this is not the reality but only a dream; you have not arrived.
This can happen at many points, again and again. And one can get very irritated and annoyed with the master for the simple reason that whenever you feel you have got it, he simply takes it away and puts you back into your ignorant state.

For example, it was happening to a German sannyasin continuously. Whenever he was in Germany he was living in a beautiful castle of his own -- he was very rich -- meditating; and then he would get the feeling that he had become enlightened. And the force of the illusion was so much that he could not keep it to himself, he would tell others. Not only would he tell other fellow sannyasins, he started writing letters to the presidents, prime ministers, kings, queens around the world: "I have become enlightened, and if you want any advice on any matters that concern the future of humanity in the world, I can help you."

He was so certain. This happened three times, and because of his certainty he came to India to get my blessings. Naturally, it shows his certainty that he came for my blessings. One can think that the first time perhaps he was not aware that I would destroy his illusion, but the second time, he came again after two years; and a third time, after two years again he came.

Each time I had to tell him, "You are just being deceived by your own mind. Nothing has happened to you, you are simply the old man -- the new man has not arrived. And all that you are doing -- writing letters to the U.N., to other governments -- are just ways of the ego. And you are in the grip of the ego."

Close to me, he understood. Three times he became enlightened and I had to make him unenlightened. Now, that is not a good job. The fourth time he never came back; perhaps he is afraid I will make him again unenlightened. Now he remains in his castle and remains enlightened!

It is very easy to live in a beautiful dream. It is hard to see your dreams shattered by reality.

In the ancient scriptures of the East it is called the power of maya. Mind has the hypnotic power to create any illusion. If you are after a certain thing, desperately, it is one of the functions of the mind to create the illusion to stop your desperateness. It happens every day to everybody in their dreams, but people don't learn things.

In the night you go to bed hungry. In the night you are going to have a dream about eating delicious food. The mind is trying to help you so that your sleep is not disturbed; otherwise you are hungry and you are bound to be awakened by your hunger. The mind gives you a dream that you are eating delicious food of your choice, which satisfies your mind. The hunger remains but sleep is not disturbed, The hunger is covered by the illusion of the dream; it is a protection of your sleep.

You feel in sleep that your bladder is full. If the mind does not create the dream that you have gone to the toilet, come back and gone to sleep again, then your sleep will be disturbed -- and sleep is a great necessity for the body. The mind is taking care that it is not disturbed again and again; you can have a long sleep, rest, so in the morning you are rejuvenated.

This is the ordinary function of the mind; on a higher plane the same thing happens. It is an ordinary sleep, an ordinary awakening that mind prevents. On the path, it is an extraordinary sleep and an extraordinary awakening. But the mind is programmed -- it is just a mechanical thing. It simply does its work without bothering, because it has no

way of checking whether it is ordinary sleep or spiritual sleep, ordinary awakening or spiritual awakening.

To the mind it is all the same. Its function is to keep your sleep intact and create a barrier for anything that disturbs your sleep. If you are hungry it gives you food; if you are desperately in search of truth, it gives you truth, it gives you enlightenment. You ask for anything, and it is ready to give it to you.

It can create the illusion of the real thing -- that's its intrinsic power.

Western psychology has not yet been aware of the dream's actual function, what function it has.

Sigmund Freud thinks that its only function is to bring up your repressed desires and allow them a certain illusory reality so that you don't go insane. The dream is an outlet so the steam that you go on repressing is released. That seems to be the whole understanding of Western psychology about dreams -- that it is an outlet. While you are asleep, your dreaming helps you to get rid of many aberrations.

You had seen a beautiful woman while you were awake, but you had to maintain your civilization, the civil code, manners, morality, religion, respectability, and you behaved that way. You could not behave like an animal. That's actually what you would have liked to do, but all these barriers prevent you.

In the dream you have the freedom to be an animal again, with all the freedom of an animal. You can do whatsoever you want to do with the woman. Nobody is preventing you -- no priest, no policeman. Nobody is ever going to know

what you did in your dream. Even you yourself will forget in the morning what you did in your dream.
But this is not the only function, this is a very small function of dreaming. In fact Western psychology has not divided mind's different stages the way the East has done. In Eastern psychology the most superficial state is the waking state -- very thin, very artificial. It is a social by-product.
You cannot live alone, you have to live with the society; you have to follow the rules of the game. This thin layer is created by the priests, by the parents, by the pedagogues, and by all kinds of influences on you. And you are given tremendous respect for it, you are rewarded for it.
The second layer is dreaming, which is far truer, far more natural -- out of reach of the crowd, society, education, morality, religion. You are more authentic, you are not a hypocrite in your dreaming.
The third stage is sleep mixed with dreams. That is even deeper. A few dreams float in it, and these dreams are far more important than the dreams of the second stage because the second-stage dreams are more or less reactions of your waking state. Whatever you have repressed creates them.
The third stage of sleep with dreams... these dreams have nothing to do with your waking state. These are more like visions. And if you can remember them, they can be of tremendous help for you for your spiritual growth. They show you the direction where to go, where the right way is. These dreams should not be called dreams, and they are not called dreams in the East; they are called visions. And they can happen only when you have reached the sleep of the

third strata of your mind. You are far away from your waking world, miles away. The waking world has no effect on it.

These visions are caused by the fourth stage -- which is dreamless sleep. This is the fourth stage, when dreams disappear completely -- no visions, no dreams; you are simply asleep. This is the deepest in your being. You are at the very bottom of your mind.

Patanjali, one of the most authentic seekers of the mind, and one of the oldest, ancientmost people, in many ways very rare.... For example, there are very few people who have created a whole system alone.

Yoga is the creation of one single man, Patanjali -- the whole system. And he created it to such a perfection that for five thousand years nothing has been added to it, nothing has been taken out of it. He has exhausted the whole field. It is very rare; it takes centuries for any science to become complete, and many people have to contribute to it.

There are only two cases: One is Patanjali who created a whole science of Yoga; and the other is Aristotle, who created the whole science of logic. And for two thousand years there has been no change, no improvement. But just in this century, Aristotle has lost his ground. Non-Aristotelian logic has come into being -- which is absolutely against Aristotle. But Patanjali stands like a peak of the Himalayas -- still unchallenged, still perfect and complete.

Patanjali says that the deep sleep, dreamless sleep, is exactly the same as samadhi, superconsciousness, the ultimate experience of being. It is the same; the only

difference is you are not aware of it. Dreamless sleep plus awareness is equal to enlightenment.

One has to start with the first layer of waking, and make it alert. It is a very thin layer, very superficial, but it can be used as a preface for greater things to happen. Meditation begins with wakefulness. You start becoming aware of the moments when you are awake.

Walking, eating, doing your work -- anything -- you have to make it a point that it is done in awareness, that it is not done like a robot, not mechanically. Even breathing has to be joined with awareness, so you know when the breath is going in and you know when the breath is going out.

The smallest things you have to try -- even the blinking of the eyes. The smaller the thing you try, the better, because those are the things which one ignores, and those are the things which will give you a deeper penetration into the thin layer of wakefulness.

Buddha has said that the meditator has to walk keeping his eyes only four feet away, looking at the ground, not looking all around everywhere, reading the posters on the walls, looking at people and what they are doing. He has to keep his eyes focused four feet ahead, and remain alert that he does not move from that posture.

And while he is looking four feet ahead, he has to be continuously aware of each step that he is taking. He has to walk very slowly. He has to remember the breathing, that it is going in, coming out. He has to remember the blinking of the eyes. He has to be aware of each small thing that is happening.

Being awake plus awareness will lead you to the second step: you can dream with awareness -- and that is a

tremendous experience. Then dreaming cannot deceive you; you are alert. If you are hungry, you know you are hungry, and you know the dream is trying in every way to provide delicious food, but it is just dream-food, it is not the reality. You can see both the hunger and the food. You know the hunger is true and the food is false.

As you become more and more aware of subtle nuances of dreaming, a great surprise is waiting for you. Dreams become less and less because they don't need awareness. They are very shy; they don't want to face awareness. They come only in the shadows of sleep.

But if you are alert, then naturally they stop coming. And when dreams stop coming you fall suddenly into the third state, which is sleep with visions. And there is a clear-cut distinction between dreams and visions.

Dreams disappear when you are aware, visions become more clear and solid when you are aware; they are not shy. They are part of reality, they are predictions, they may be glimpses of your future. Dreams belong to the past, visions belong to the future. They are opening doors of the unknown. And if you can see clearly, your path is made very simple. So they are of a great help.

But remember the distinction, that awareness makes them very solid, real; they don't disappear, they become perfectly clear. And soon you start discovering that what you have seen in your visions comes to be true in life.

Dreams are simply repressed parts of life.

They are intuitive, and once you have become aware that you have seen them before.... For example, in the vision you see a man that you have never seen, and the next morning you open your door and the man is standing there.

The vision has prepared you for something. The man is no ordinary man, there must be something significant. He is a guest to be honored and respected. Your intuition has made you already aware of it, that he is carrying a treasure for you. Something is going to happen with this man, something is going to transpire between him and you.

In fact, most of the people find their master through visions. Thinking is of not any help. What can you think about a master?

And the people who go to a master through thinking always go to a wrong person, because thinking is a by-product of the society.

You are born in a Hindu family or a Christian family or a Buddhist family -- those families have given you a certain idea of what a saint is. Your thinking cannot go beyond it, and if you go through thinking to find a master, you will end up with somebody who is trying to be a saint according to the expectations of the society. He is not really a saint; he is just rehearsing a part that he wants to play in life.

Only through visions do you come across beings who are not according to your expectations. In fact, they have nothing to do with your mind. It is through the tremendous sensitivity of your intuition that you start seeing something of the future. It is through the height of your awareness that what is future for others becomes present for you.

For example, it is like this: A man is standing by the side of a tree, and he looks at the road -- the road is empty. He looks behind him, at the road that he has traveled -- it is empty. He looks ahead to the future, the road that he is going to travel -- it is empty. But at exactly that same

moment, another man is sitting in the tree. He has a bigger perspective, he can see more of the road.
He sees a horseman coming closer to the tree. That horseman is present to him, but that horseman is future to the man who is standing by the side of the tree. So what is future to one man can be present to another: it depends on his height, on his perspective, on his alertness.
It is a known fact that thousands of saints down the ages have predicted their death -- the exact time, days before, sometimes months before -- because in the old days their disciples were miles away; they had to be informed that the master is going to leave the body. They have to come because the master cannot leave the body without saying goodbye to them, or maybe there is a last message.
So disciples from faraway places will start traveling -- it will take time but they will all reach and the master will die exactly at the time he has declared. It is part of the vision -- he knows when death is going to happen. To him it is already present; to his disciples it is future -- maybe three weeks, maybe four weeks. He has seen it already.
So the vision is a tremendous help to the seeker -- where to go? with whom to go? whom to trust? It is not a question of the mind deciding. The deepest part of your consciousness has already decided, and there is no question of doubt about it.
I am reminded of a Sufi story. A king was told by his prime minister, "In your whole kingdom there is only one beggar, and it is within your powers -- you can easily make that beggar a rich man. And that is the only blemish on your kingdom. Your kingdom can be free of beggars, it is already free -- there is only one beggar."

The king said, "I know it. I have tried, but my visions are not in agreement with my mind. That man will remain a beggar; whatever we do is going to be futile."
The prime minister was a man of intelligence, intellect -- he said, "I don't believe... why should he remain a beggar? If we give him some money, a good house to live in, he will not be a beggar."
The king said, "Wait for tomorrow morning. Let me check."
The prime minister said, "With whom are you going to check? I am the person, your adviser -- you have to check with me. About whom are you talking?"
The king laughed. He said, "You may not understand. I always have to check my visions, because I have noticed that when my vision has said, `Don't go to war,' if I went, I was defeated, even though I was mightier than the enemy. And there were times when the enemy was mightier and I was weaker, but my vision said, `Go ahead,' and I was victorious. So it is there that I have to check: what my vision says about this beggar.
"And this is my method, that I go to sleep thinking about a certain thing, for example this beggar. I will fall asleep thinking about this beggar. Slowly, slowly it settles to the point where visions happen."
And the next morning the king said, "It is not possible, but I will give it a try, just to show you that it is not possible."
The beggar used to pass along a bridge. Just in front of the palace there was a river, and he used to pass over the bridge and sit on the other corner of it to beg the whole day.
The king, in disguise, and the prime minister, in disguise went on to the bridge early in the morning when the beggar

used to come, with a big pot full of gold coins -- enough for the beggar to live his whole life luxuriously. There was nobody on the bridge -- it was too early in the morning and it was too cold.

The king put the pot with the gold coins in the middle of the bridge, and they both went away to the other corner to see what happened.

The beggar was coming. He was not blind, and on the whole bridge there was nothing except the pot, but the prime minister was surprised that the beggar was coming with closed eyes. He passed the pot full of gold coins with closed eyes, groping his way.

When he reached close to the king and the prime minister, they asked him, "What is the matter -- you are not blind, and you have never done this before. Why are you walking with closed eyes?"

The beggar said, "Just as I got onto the bridge the idea occurred to me: what if I go blind, then how would I manage to walk along the bridge? So I closed my eyes and tried to walk along the bridge as a blind man. And you should be happy that I managed it."

The king turned to the prime minister: "What do you say? I had seen this whole scene in my vision -- that the beggar will pass the pot with closed eyes, and he will have a reason, he will give an argument. It happens to everybody, once in a while, to want to walk with closed eyes to see how it feels -- but exactly on that day?"

Once you have become aware of the reality of your visions, you are safe from your dreams, from your mind. And you are in a state where trust is possible. Not that you have to do anything, just your visions will make you trust.

The real masters are found through visions.
And then you can give yourself up totally into the hands of the master. Below this stage, if you go on with awareness, visions will not be happening every day. Once in a while, only when something is very important that existence wants you to be alert about.... It is your connection with life, with existence, with the cosmos.
So visions will happen only once in a while -- not an everyday affair -- but whenever they happen they are going to materialize in reality soon. You have been warned beforehand.
If you remain aware you will reach the fourth stage -- dreamless sleep. The word of Patanjali is sushupti -- dreamless sleep. And he says sushupti and samadhi, dreamless sleep and the ultimate awakening, are exactly the same. The only difference is of awareness.
If you can go with awareness into dreamless sleep, it explodes. There is an explosion of light, suddenly you are full of light. Your whole mind -- dreams, sleep, everything is gone. There is only pure awareness.
On the way, the disciple can first be misled when he is trying awareness in the waking mind. If you just put a watch with a second hand in front of you and keep your eyes on the second hand, you will be surprised: you cannot continue to remember even for one minute completely. Perhaps fifteen seconds, twenty seconds, at the most thirty seconds, and you will forget. You will get lost in some other idea -- and then suddenly you will remember that you were trying to remember.
Even to keep awareness continuous for one minute is difficult, so one has to be aware that it is not child's play.

So when you are trying to be aware of the small things of life, you have to remember that many times you will forget. You will go far away into something else. The moment you remember, don't feel guilty -- that is one of the traps.
If you start feeling guilty, then you cannot come back to the awareness that you were practicing. There is no need to feel guilty, it is natural. Don't feel repentance. It is simple, and it happens to every seeker. Accept it as natural; otherwise you will be caught in repentance, in the guilt that you cannot remember even for a few moments and you go on forgetting.
Mahavira is the first man in history who has actually worked out that if a man can remember, be aware, for forty-eight minutes continuously, that's enough -- he will become enlightened, nobody can prevent him. Just forty-eight minutes... but it is difficult even for forty-eight seconds -- so many distractions.
No guilt, no repentance -- the moment you remember that you have forgotten what you were doing, simply come back; simply come back and start working again.
My emphasis is, simply come back. Don't cry and weep for the spilled milk, that is stupid.
It will take time, but slowly you will become aware that you are remaining alert more and more, perhaps for a whole minute, perhaps two minutes.
And it is such a joy that you have been aware for two minutes -- but don't get caught in the joy.
Don't think that you have attained something. That will become a barrier. These are patterns where one is lost. Just a little gain and one thinks one has come home. Go on

working slowly, patiently. There is no hurry -- you have eternity at your disposal.
Don't try to be speedy. That impatience will not help. Awareness is not like seasonal flowers that grow in six weeks' time and are then gone. Awareness is like the cedars of Lebanon which take hundreds of years to grow; but they remain for thousands of years and rise to one hundred and fifty feet, two hundred feet high in the sky. They are really very proud people.
Awareness grows very slowly, but it grows. One has to just be patient.
As it grows you will start feeling many things which you have never felt before. For example, you will start feeling that you are carrying many tensions in your body of which you have never been aware because they are subtle tensions. Now your awareness is there you can feel those very subtle, very delicate tensions.
So wherever you feel any tension in the body, relax that part. If your whole body is relaxed, your awareness will grow faster because those tensions are hindrances.
As your awareness grows even more, you will be surprised to know that you don't dream only in sleep; there is an undercurrent of dreaming even while you are awake. It goes just underneath your wakefulness -- close your eyes any moment and you can see some dream passing by like a cloud in the sky. But only when you become a little more aware will it be possible to see that your wakefulness in not true awakenedness.
The dream is floating there -- people call it daydream. If they relax in their chair for a moment and close their eyes, immediately the dream takes over. They start thinking that

they have become the president of the country, or they are doing great things -- or anything, which they know at the very moment they are dreaming is all nonsense. You are not the president of the country, but still the dream has something in it, that it continues in spite of you.

Awareness will make you aware of layers of dreams in your waking state. And they will start dispersing, just as you bring light into a dark room and the darkness starts dispersing.

Awareness functions almost like a light. If you can disperse your dreams in the waking state, your waking state will have a clarity, your intelligence will have a newness to it. These will be the by-products.

You will be able to see things which you were not able to see before. You will be able to reason, argue. You will be able to see your conditionings, which you were never able to before; you had accepted them in your childhood when there was no argument, no reasoning.

Then you will see that your god is a lie, your heaven and hell are lies; that you have been fed with lies and at the same time all these people have been telling you to be true, to be honest.

When I entered the university, on the gate of the university there was written: "Truth is God."

Just on the main gate -- that was the motto of that university -- "Truth is God."

I had one other friend with me who had come to join the university.

I told him, "First I will see the vice-chancellor, and then I will think about whether to join this university or not --

because from the very gate they have started lying. They cannot even wait for the person to enter the university." The university is almost two miles away from the main gate. Then there are professors' houses, then botanical gardens, then the departments, and then at the end comes the vice-chancellor's office.

I went to the vice-chancellor and I said, "I want to talk with you about this sentence, `Truth is God.' I had come to join the university but that sentence prevents me."

He said, "What! Why should that sentence prevent you? Don't you think truth is God?"

I said, "No. Truth has nothing to do with God -- truth is simply truth. Why are you managing to bring God behind truth? Truth is not God -- God is a lie. This is the truth. You will have to prove to me that God is not a lie; otherwise I will have to find another university. This one seems to be from the very beginning based on lies."

The old vice-chancellor was in shock. He was a believer in God; that's why he had written that sentence: "Truth is God." But he said, "It is difficult for me to prove that God is not a lie because I have never experienced God."

Then I said, "I will enter the university only on the condition that that sentence is removed from the main gate. And if you don't remove it, I will remain here -- I will not enter the university but I will approach every student, every professor and ask the same question that I have asked you. And you are inviting unnecessary trouble. The best way is just remove that sentence."

He said, "I will have to think about it. People will ask, `Why are you removing it?' It has been there since the university has been founded.'"

I said, "That is not my concern. If it is a lie, the sooner it is removed, the better. And what can you think about it? You don't know God. How are you going to think about something you don't know? Do you know truth? What are you going to think about these things which you don't know? Better you remove that sentence."

He was really a gentleman, he agreed to remove it. And he said, "You join the university. I love your straightforwardness, and I love your sincerity. Perhaps you are right, but you have disturbed not only the board, you have disturbed my whole life. I have been worshipping God every morning -- now tomorrow I will hesitate. Even if I worship, the old faith will not be there."

I said, "Faith is not needed at all. What is needed is a trust that arises out of your visions, out of your awareness."

So as you become aware, your conditionings will start falling this way and that way. Christianity, Hinduism, Buddhism -- they will start disappearing from your wakefulness. You will start discovering your own identity, which has been covered with so many labels.

In the second step, dreams can delude you. That is where the master will be of immense help. He can tell you that you are dreaming, that you are awake. The Zen master in Japan has developed a staff; he moves amongst his disciples who are meditating with his staff. So whosoever he feels is dreaming, he hits him on the head... because when you start dreaming, you start dozing. Your face immediately changes. When you are awake, your face has a certain quality; when you start dreaming, it has a different quality -- and immediately the hit comes.

Suddenly you are awake and the disciple is expected to bow down and touch the feet of the master in gratitude for his compassion that he did not allow him to fall into the trap of dreams.

In the third stage the master will be helpful in making it clear to you that what you are seeing now are not dreams. Listen to them, follow them -- they are indications of your destiny. If you go astray, you will miss fulfillment. These visions are showing you the right path to follow.

But still there is a danger -- the danger of getting very egoistic because you can know the future. Not only can you know your future, if you try a little harder you can start seeing other people's futures. It is in this stage that all astrology has been born. It has nothing to do with stars -- that is just a facade to deceive you. It has nothing to do with the lines of the hand.

It is a visionary who can manage to look into your future. But that can give him the role of a prophet. The word "prophet" comes from prophecy. Only in India have there been no prophets -- you will be surprised. In Judaism there have been prophets, in Christianity there have been prophets, in Mohammedanism there have been prophets. It is only in India that there have been no prophets, which is strange because this is the most religious part of the world, and the most ancient in religion, deep in religion.

What happened to the prophets? Why did they not appear here? -- because every disciple was made aware by the master that these visions are not to make you a prophet, that you are not to move in that direction, that it is a false direction. Use these visions to go deeper, to the fourth.

Don't start using these visions to play around and show your power.

This is the greatest trap that waits for the disciple, because the attraction is immense -- to tell somebody his future, that "tomorrow this is going to happen to you."

One man came to see me in Bombay. He is a film actor; once he was famous, now he has faded away. That's what happens to every film star. But he has been interested in predictions, prophecies, astrology, palmistry and all kinds of things of that sort.

His wife was interested in me, so she brought him to see me. And he told me, "I can tell you what is going to happen in your future."

And I could see that the man had some visionary power, but I told him, "Give it to me in writing for only one year, and I will do exactly the opposite that you predict. If you say that I will die, then I won't die. If you say I will live, I can even try to die."

He became so afraid... I said, "You just write it down precisely, and after one year I will see you. And whatever you write will not happen. I know that you have a certain capacity of vision, but you are using it wrongly. You don't have a master. I am asking you to write one year's predictions about me so that after one year you can have a master."

The man said, "I will have to think about it; this is risky."

He never came back. The next day his wife came and said, "He is not willing to write anything, because he feels you can do just the opposite, and after one year you will prove him to be a failure. And you have said, `after one year you will get your master.' And he is so egoistic; because he has

certain visions, he does not think he needs any master -- he himself is a master."

So this is one of the greatest traps, because as power grows you are closer to being trapped. And this is the last trap.

It happened in the life of Vivekananda in Ramakrishna's ashram, in Dakshineshwar, in Calcutta, Bengal.... There were many disciples, and Vivekananda was one of the most intellectual disciples of Ramakrishna. There was a very simple man who was also a disciple -- his name was Kalu, a poor man. He was so faithful, religious, emotional, that he had in his room hundreds of statues of different gods, because in India the traditional number of gods is thirty-three million. So he had hundreds of statues, and it was such a long affair to worship all those gods that it was only in the afternoon that he was able to take his breakfast. Early, at four o'clock in the morning, he would take a bath in the Ganges, and then the worship would begin. And of course each god had to be worshipped equally; otherwise somebody may get angry, somebody may feel offended. So the whole day was lost and everybody was laughing at Kalu: "What are you doing? Just one god is enough!"

But Kalu said, "I have become so attached to these hundreds of gods -- whom to reject? And whoever I reject will become annoyed. So in this life it is impossible; I have to worship these hundreds of gods and I have to give equal time to each."

Vivekananda was the most prominent in making a fool of Kalu. He said, "You are simply stupid -- these are just stones! And you are wasting your life." But Kalu would not listen to anyone; he continued his way.

One day Ramakrishna gave Vivekananda a certain method of awareness to practice: "Go into your cell, close the door and practice it." When Vivekananda came to a certain stage of awareness he felt himself so full of power that the idea came to his mind, "If I say at this moment just within myself, to Kalu, `Take all your gods and throw them into the Ganges,' he will do it."

He was so certain of it. And he did it, he said to Kalu, in his own cell, just within himself, "Kalu, just collect all your gods" -- and this was the time when he was worshipping the gods -- and throw them all into the Ganges."

And Kalu collected all his gods into a big bag and was dragging the bag down the steps when Ramakrishna ran after him, stopped him and said, "What are you doing?"

He said, "Suddenly I heard a voice -- it must have come from God himself, because there was nobody in the room -- saying, `Kalu, collect all your gods and throw them into the Ganges.' It was so powerful that I could not doubt it."

Ramakrishna said, "Come back. Take your gods back and I will show you from where the voice has come." He knocked on Vivekananda's door. Vivekananda came out and Ramakrishna was very angry. He said, "Vivekananda, this is the last thing I had ever expected of you. I had told you to be aware -- not to destroy a poor man's life. This is his whole life, and he is no harm to anybody. He is so simple-hearted, so loving, such a beautiful man -- how could you do it to him? Awareness is not for such things. And from now onwards I will keep the key of your awareness; you will never attain to the same power again."

It is a very significant story. And it is said Vivekananda died without attaining enlightenment because the key was

kept by the master. He never showed Vivekananda the way to go deeper. He tried hard in his own way but always went round and round, could not enter within himself. Although he became Ramakrishna's successor because he was the most intellectual -- a great orator, a very powerful personality, had a certain charisma, influenced people -- he himself died a poor man, knowing nothing. And the reason was that he disturbed a simple-hearted man because he got just a little power and he immediately used it -- not for the benefit of somebody, but to harm somebody.
There are traps and traps.
And the master is needed in many ways: to keep you aware not to use your power in any harmful way to others, not to use your power in any way harmful to yourself, not to use your power as an ego-trip. And he has to go on reminding you that you have to transform your sushupti, your dreamless sleep, into samadhi, into superconsciousness.

Light on the Path

Chapter #19
Chapter title: The path of truth is only for gamblers
20 January 1986 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
I HAVE A FEW QUESTIONS THAT ARE CONNECTED TO EACH OTHER. THE FIRST IS: YESTERDAY YOU SPOKE ON THE FUNCTION OF THE MASTER. I WOULD LIKE TODAY IF YOU COULD SPEAK ON

THE FUNCTION OF THE DISCIPLE AND, IF THE DISCIPLE NEEDS THE MASTER, DOES THE MASTER NEED THE DISCIPLE? AND ALSO, YOU CONTINUOUSLY EMPHASIZE THE GUTS AND THE COURAGE THAT ARE NEEDED BY THE DISCIPLE. I HAVE NO EXPERIENCE OF THAT. I WOULD LIKE YOU TO EXPLAIN IT. AND FINALLY, I HAVE HEARD THAT IT IS NOT THE DISCIPLE WHO CHOOSES THE MASTER, THE MASTER CHOOSES THE DISCIPLE. PLEASE COMMENT.

It is certainly the master who chooses the disciple, but his choosing always remains indirect. He always gives a chance to the disciple to choose.

The disciple is not even aware that he has been already chosen. But without the master choosing the disciple, there is no way for the disciple to choose the master; his choice comes second. But the master never imposes, he makes it always free for the disciple to choose.

The reason is clear. The disciple is asleep; he has no idea who is awake and who is not. He is dreaming -- how can he choose? Whatever he chooses is almost certainly going to be wrong. It is a rare coincidence that he may choose the right person, simply because he is unconscious, he is asleep.

Just think of this room -- a few persons are sleeping and one person is awake. Now, can the sleeping persons choose who should wake them up? That is impossible. If they can choose that, then what is the need of the master? -- they can wake themselves up. They are already awake if they can choose who should wake them.

The whole burden falls on the master to choose whom to wake. He has certain ways to know who is very close to awakening. Even if you are watching a few sleeping people you can decide who is very fast asleep, deeply asleep, snoring; and who is sleeping very light -- a thin layer of sleep, and is already on the verge. If somebody can wake him up, it is not going to take time. But there is every possibility, if nobody wakes him, he may slip back into deep sleep, turn over again and pull the blanket over himself.

Spiritual sleep is not very different from ordinary sleep -- just a little more complicated and more subtle. It is one of the functions of the master to choose the disciple but never to let the disciple know that he has been chosen. That is disturbing his independence, that is taking away his freedom.

As far as the disciple is concerned the master allows him to think that he is the chooser. That is out of his compassion. Even when the master does something, he makes it appear as if it has been done by the disciple.

You are asking... I have talked about the functions of the master -- what are the functions of the disciple? The functions of the disciple are very simple. Condensed to one single word it is receptivity, non-resistance, availability, saying with a full heart "Yes!"

There should be no shadow of "No." That is the barrier. The master cannot function with a "no" standing between him and the disciple, because he cannot be violent, he cannot destroy the "no." He cannot remove it because all that will be interfering with the disciple's innermost life.

So it is the function of the disciple not to put the master in such a situation where he cannot work. His yes, total and unconditional, gives the whole scope to the master to work. And now there is no question of interference: you have allowed the master to be a guest in your innermost being, you have become a host. And it is one of the greatest joys for the disciple to experience that the master has come within him and he has not resisted.

His whole life he has been resisting. He has never allowed anyone a total yes -- not even his lovers, not even his parents, not even his friends, not even his children. To no one has he ever said an unconditional yes, it has always been conditional. And conditional means mixed with no. It has never been pure.

He has always been guarding himself -- not only against enemies but against friends too. In fact one does not need to guard himself against enemies too much because they are always far away; they are not that dangerous. The real question is of those who are very close to you, very close to your being. They can stab a knife in your back very easily. You have to be constantly on guard.

There is an Urdu poem with a statement which is very significant. It says, "I will take care of my enemies, God, but you please take care of my friends. I am not in danger from the enemies, I know them -- I am on guard. But about friends I am confused. And to be on guard with friends is painful. So you take care of me against my friends."

It is only with the master that for the first time you put all your guards away. That's the only function of the disciple -- great, arduous, but single. It implies everything: openness, readiness to go wherever the master is leading him. It is a

way of becoming part of the being of the master -- allowing him to be within you -- now there is no fear.

This is the place that you have been guarding your whole life. You have never invited anybody to be a guest.

This is the conflict between lovers, the eternal conflict. All others are simply excuses. The basic and fundamental conflict is that the woman or the man wants to be at the innermost center of the being of the person he loves or she loves.

But it cannot happen as far as lovers are concerned because both are asleep; both are full of egos, both are capable of changing any moment. Their love can become hate, their friendship can turn into enmity. It cannot be opened for a sleepy person, so no lover has ever opened it.

And I don't see that there is anything wrong in it; it can simply not be opened. It can be opened only to a person who is awake, who cannot harm you, who is beyond harming you. The woman you love can harm you, the man you love can harm you. Not that they want to harm you, but they are unconscious beings. They may have no intention of harming you, but still, without any intention to harm you, harm can happen.

In sleep they can stumble, in sleep anything is possible.

And this is the conflict that goes on. They don't know even why they are continuously quarreling. They feel sometimes that they are quarreling about stupid things, petty, meaningless, and they wonder why they go on fighting about such stupid things. But they never discover that the foundation lying underneath what they want, is that they want to become one with the lover or the beloved.

Even the act of making love is nothing but an effort to become one, somehow to become joined; rather than being two bodies, to become one body. But it is not going to satisfy because the need is to become one soul, not one body.

So love, strangely, frustrates people more than anything else in existence, for the simple reason that it goes on giving you the hope that perhaps -- because this is the biggest and the greatest thing that you know -- there may come a moment when you may become one. But at the most you can become one with the body, and then you are stuck; your souls are as apart as ever. There is no meeting of the souls.

After making love to a woman you are not happy, the woman is not happy. Something unknown has been missing in it -- nothing that can be pointed out by them, but it was not what they were hoping for, it was not the goal of their desire. It fell short, and each time it falls short, frustration gets deeper, boredom gets deeper, hopelessness settles. One starts thinking, "Perhaps we are not made for each other. Perhaps it is time to change partners, to find somebody else."

But the same will happen with everybody. There is no way to make it a reality at that stage, where you are both asleep. So the relationship with the master is unique.

You withdraw all your barriers, you destroy all the walls, you make all possible bridges, and you are just a welcome. And you wait patiently, trusting that when everything is ready, and even the shadow of a no is not there and yes is all over the space, the master is bound to come in. And that

is the greatest gift the master can give to the disciple. You lose nothing and you gain immensely, incalculably.
So all that is needed on the part of the disciple is not to repeat old patterns of many kinds of relationships with the master. Let it be a new relationship which you have never lived. Let it be absolutely untouched by your past. Let it be unique. And that's why I insist again and again, that the disciple needs guts, courage.
To leave oneself unguarded after many many lives of guarding, protecting, not letting anyone in, has become almost second nature. To break through this whole structure, to rise above it -- certainly courage, great courage is needed.
Courage simply means risking everything -- whatever the consequence, not thinking of the consequence -- risking your very life. It is a gamble; you don't know what is going to happen. You have never experienced anything like that before -- how can you know?
So you are putting at risk, at stake, everything that you know, for something that you know not; hence I have said many times: the path of truth is only for gamblers.
I am reminded of a Japanese film actor. He lived in America, in Hollywood, before the second world war, earned much fame and earned much money... so much that now he had no need to work. He could live for lives in luxury. So he went back to Japan, but he wanted to see Paris first, so he went via Paris.
He was staying in one of the most luxurious hotels, on the topmost floor. And there was a casino in the hotel. He went there -- it must have been late evening -- and he staked everything that he had earned, not even saving money for

the ticket to reach home. He lost everything, and he went back to the room. There was complete silence because never before had anybody staked such a vast amount of money.

Kings had been there, emperors had been there -- he defeated them all. And they all had sympathy for the man because he lost everything on just one stake. In deep silence he simply moved all around.

The next morning in the newspapers, it was announced that a Japanese had committed suicide by throwing himself under a fast-running train. The hotel manager, the hotel staff, and everybody who had seen what had happened the night before, immediately thought that this Japanese could not be anyone other than the man who had staked everything.

They all rushed to the room of the Japanese actor. They knocked, he opened the door. He asked, "What is the matter -- why this crowd?"

They said, "We are sorry, really very sorry, but we thought, looking at this newspaper.... The body was almost crushed into so many pieces that they could not even recognize the face; just from the passport they understood that he was Japanese. So we thought perhaps you were the person, because last night you staked everything and you lost everything, and these are the moments when people commit suicide."

The actor laughed. He said, "I am not the one. I had earned, I had staked, I have lost. But it was only money; I have not lost myself. I can earn again; and believe me, if I earn again, I will come again and stake again! I am not such a coward as to commit suicide -- for money? -- which any

idiot can earn. It does not matter; if I had won the money I would have remained the same. I have lost the money -- I am the same.

"Before I became an actor I was with a master who taught only one thing: Remain the same in every situation, good or bad, success or victory, failure or loss -- everything, as long as you are there, only a witness.

"I had a good sleep, and just now I was thinking from where to start again. But it has not scratched me."

Staking everything, knowing that you are gambling with the unknown... you may be victorious, you may be a failure, but it does not matter. You are not hoping for victory, because that will become a misery if you don't succeed. You are not afraid of losing because then again you will be miserable if you lose. Having no conditions you stake.

And being with a master, the beauty is that, although you are staking everything for something unknown, yet just in front of you there is someone who knows the unknown, who has been through the same process and has come back. This is true resurrection. There is no other resurrection except this -- dying, not knowing whether you will be resurrected or not.

But if you are with a master and you see, you feel the flavor of resurrection, that gives you a tremendous impetus to be courageous. It makes your dormant courage dynamic, alive, functioning.

It is something like a small child walking by the side of his father, holding his father's hand. The father may be worried -- there are a thousand and one problems for him -- but the child is enjoying the morning sun, the beautiful breeze, the

flowers, the butterflies and he is asking question after question. He has no worry. He is certain -- his hand is in his father's hand -- and that's enough.

To be with a master is to be in a tremendously trustful atmosphere so you can easily withdraw your guards, barriers, protections; you can be vulnerable, you can be open -- open to the very end. And if the master becomes a guest within you, your whole life is transformed.

You have also asked: I say the disciple needs the master; does the master also need the disciple?

Yes. In existence everything is interdependent. In existence there is nothing like dependence, nothing like independence -- which are just extremes, just ideas. Reality is always in the middle of the extremes. It is an interdependence.

Here, everything depends on everything else; although no pseudo-master will accept this, that he needs disciples. He will try to prove that he is absolutely independent, he needs nothing. And that is simply nonsense.

We are not islands, we are part of a vast continent.

The master needs the disciple in the same sense as the raincloud needs somewhere to pour its water. It is heavy. The master is heavy with his experience. It is a beautiful ecstatic experience, but still, it is too much: he wants somebody to share it. And the beauty of sharing is, the more he shares, the more he finds that his experience goes on becoming bigger and bigger. It is inexhaustible.

So it is not only a question of needing one disciple; he can have millions of disciples and still he is in need of disciples. There is no limit to it. The disciple needs only one master; the master needs millions of disciples for the

simple reason that something is continuously growing in him.

Enlightenment is not the end. Yes, it is the end of sleep, it is the end of darkness, it is the end of unconsciousness. But it is also a great beginning, a new flowering, an endless growth.

The master will have to share it. He cannot contain it within himself. He will die if he tries to contain it within himself. His experience will kill him.

It has happened thousands of times that people become enlightened and die immediately, almost simultaneously. Their enlightenment and death come together. The reason is that they have not created before enlightenment a certain capacity to be articulate, a certain skill to be a master -- a totally different art which has nothing to do with enlightenment.

There are many people who are enlightened but not necessarily masters. A master needs expression, a master needs a certain charisma. A master needs to be so articulate that he can manage within words that which cannot be managed within words, that he can find new ways of indicating the truth, that he can impress and influence. Even people who are fast asleep -- he is even capable of reaching them.

Even in their sleep he manages to talk with them, to persuade them to come out of their sleep. It is a great skill, and one has to learn it before one becomes enlightened, because afterwards there is no time.

So if you are ready to be a master and become enlightened, then you can remain alive because now you know how to

share it, how to spread it far and wide, how to give it to people who have never thought about it.
Ordinary economics has a principle. Ricardo was the founder of the principle -- it is that wherever there is demand, there will be a supply.
In the world of enlightenment it is just the reverse. There is no demand and the master has something -- the supply comes first; then he creates the demand. The Ricardian principle does not work. We will have to say, "Wherever there is a supply, there will be a demand."
But then the person who is supplying something has to be very masterful, because people don't want it. Who wants enlightenment? Who wants the ultimate experience? Who is seeking the truth? And the master has all the commodities for which there is no market, no customers. And all his commodities are invisible -- he cannot place them before you. He cannot give you some experience, some taste, before you are ready to be a customer. Selling invisible things, one needs tremendous preparation.
So only once in a while there is a master; otherwise people become enlightened and die. The experience is too much; it simply stops their breathing; it simply stops their heartbeat. Out of sheer joy they forget to breathe, they forget that their heart has to continue to beat. And it is so much, so big, and they are so small. They have always thought of themselves as small, and now suddenly a whole mountain has descended over them -- beautiful, ecstatic, but it brings death unless they are capable of immediately sharing it.
The master needs disciples; otherwise he cannot even live. The disciple can live without the master -- although he will be asleep, which is not much of a life. But still he can

subsist, survive. The master cannot even survive. His need for disciples is far more urgent than the disciple's need of a master. It is not just a coincidence that Buddha walked on for forty-two years continuously searching for disciples.

I am reminded of one instance: Buddha is coming to a village -- it is just time for the sun to set. And a girl not more than fourteen years old is rushing towards a field where her father is working and may be working late into the night.

She tells Buddha, "Wait until I come -- don't start speaking! I am going to take food to my father; he is going to stay late working in the field. But remember, you should not speak until I get back!"

Buddha reaches the town. The people are waiting there; thousands of people from all the neighboring villages have come, but Buddha says, "You will have to wait a little because I have promised someone that I will wait. And the person I have promised is the only person for whom I have come here, the only person who has the capacity to listen. So if I speak now, it will be useless."

It takes almost an hour and people start getting upset by the whole thing: "He is waiting for one person, and thousands of people are here. We don't have any value in his eyes -- just one person?"

And then the girl appears, and that is a shock to the whole crowd; it is not even a person! Just a small girl. What can she understand?

And as the girl approaches, she says to Buddha, "You are a man of your word. I was worried, but you waited. Now you can start. And trust me -- the way you have waited for one hour, I have been waiting for years to listen to you, just to

see you. I have heard so much about you, I am full of you, although I have not seen you before."
Buddha speaks, and exactly what he has said, happens: the girl takes initiation and becomes part of his commune. Those thousands of people just listen and go back to their homes, saying, "He is a strange fellow! He says things which are against tradition, but the way he talks -- at least when he is talking, it seems that he is right. But when you start thinking about it, when you remember your tradition, your scriptures, then things are no longer clear. He confuses us." But the girl became a sannyasin.
For forty-two years Buddha was running. Even at the age of eighty-two when he was so old, he went on. The day he died, he asked his disciples, "I am leaving my body. Do you have any questions?" Certainly that was not the time for questions, and he had answered almost all the questions for forty-two years continuously.
They said, "We don't have any questions -- you can relax. You need not worry about it, we will follow the path, we promise you. We will miss you, but we will not move away from what you have made us. Our search will continue in the same direction you have indicated."
So Buddha closes his eyes, relaxes his body, relaxes his mind -- and at that very moment a man from the village comes running, and he says, "I want to ask something." Ananda, Buddha's chief disciple, says, "Be silent. Where have you been for forty-two years? Buddha passed your town dozens of times."
He said, "I am sorry. I am stupid, but it was always some excuse that prevented me. Sometimes it was that customers were there at my shop. So I could not close the shop, and I

could not reach Buddha's sermon. Sometimes my wife was sick and she insisted that I should sit by her side. Sometimes I myself was sick; sometimes there was no excuse but I simply thought, `He is always coming and going. I can go anytime.'

"I had started taking him for granted. I had forgotten that even a buddha has to die. Don't prevent me, because it may be many lives before I meet a man of his caliber again."

This quarrel is going on between Ananda and the villager, and Buddha opens his eyes and says to Ananda, "Ananda, let him ask the question, so for the future generations it becomes something of a remembrance that, even dying, a master is willing -- with his very last breath -- to accept a disciple.

"And please don't stop him; otherwise it will remain a blemish on me, that I was still alive and a disciple returned empty-handed. And he has come sincerely. All those years, it would not have been of much use even if he had come; it would have been simply a formality. But today he has come -- with tears in his eyes -- afraid, trembling, because it is questionable whether he will meet another awakened man for many lives; and he does not want to miss the chance.

"And don't let history say that Gautam Buddha was alive, and yet somebody went thirsty from his door. I will answer him." And before his death he initiated the man.

The master has a need, a tremendous need, of sharing. But it is a strange need, because with the word "need" we think you want to get something.

The master's need is not to get something, his need is to give something. With the master even the quality of the need changes to its diametrically opposite meaning.

Light on the Path

Chapter #20

Chapter title: Nobody can expect consistency from me
21 January 1986 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
THESE QUESTIONS ARE FROM THE DUTCH RAJNEESH TIMES. THE FIRST QUESTION IS: NOW YOU ARE MAKING A WORLD TOUR, FOR THE FIRST TIME THE WELL IS GOING TO THE THIRSTY. IS THE WORLD READY TO RECEIVE THE WELL?

It has been ready for a long time -- not the whole world but just the chosen few.
The whole world perhaps may never be ready. It is unfortunate, but unavoidable, because the world has no awareness of the present or of the future; it lives only in the past. It walks ahead but looks backward. That is the fundamental cause of all accidents -- all the wars, and all the blood that has been shed on the earth.
People are looking back and walking forward.
Why do they look back? Their psychology has to be understood: They have lived the past, they are acquainted with it. It may not have been blissful -- it was not. It may

have been painful, miserable -- it was, but human mind clings to the known. It has a certain logic; the known may be painful, miserable, but at least it is known. Who knows? -- the unknown may be more painful, more miserable. And we know how to deal with the known; we don't know how to deal with the unknown.

We have become accustomed to the known; it is painful, but because we have been living in it for so long even the pain has become part of us. The misery has become our way of life. Slowly, slowly we have accepted it; now it no longer hurts.

In fact the mind is afraid that if all this pain, misery and suffering is taken away, it will find itself in a space with which it is absolutely unacquainted; and that is frightening. The greatest fear in the world is the fear of the unknown -- and mind is a coward. Hence, the world at large perhaps may never be ready. Not that it does not feel the thirst; it feels the thirst, but it has not the guts to recognize it. Even to recognize it is dangerous. That means the beginning of a search, the beginning of a seeking, again moving into the unknown.

The moment you start searching, you become alone.

If you don't search, you are surrounded by a crowd, a vast crowd of believers, of people who have faith. The crowd gives you a certain warmth, coziness. It makes you feel that you must be right because so many people, millions of people, are on the same way. You can be wrong, but so many people cannot be wrong. And if they are all moving in the same direction, it brings you a certainty.

That's why people want to belong to a church, to a religion, to a dogma, to a creed, to an ideology -- political, religious,

social; but they want to belong to a crowd, they don't want to stand alone.
To stand alone... the fear arises: Who knows whether you are right or wrong?
To stand alone, you stand in coldness.
To stand alone, you lose the coziness of the crowd. To stand alone, you lose the faith of the fanatic. To stand alone, you lose the authority of a long tradition.
But if you recognize your thirst, you have to stand alone and you have to walk alone, because the truth is never found by the crowd. It is never found on the superhighway. There are not even footpaths which lead to it. As you search for it, as you walk, you create your footpath yourself. It is a very strange phenomenon. You don't have a footpath ready-made, waiting for you, which will lead you to the truth, to the temple; you have to walk, and just by walking you have to create it.
Each step is full of hesitation, fear, trembling. You cannot be certain because you don't have any map -- there exists none. You don't know where you are moving -- are you going towards the truth or away from it?
That's why I say it needs guts, courage. It needs the courage of the gambler who can stake everything, not knowing what is going to be the result. He may lose all or he may win all. All or none -- that is the choice facing you on each step, every moment. One who accepts this situation becomes more and more integrated, becomes more and more independent, becomes more and more together, centered, rooted.
And as all these tremendously significant things are happening to his being, he finds a new warmth which

comes from his own innermost source, a new coziness which is not dependent on the crowd, on anybody else. He finds a new clarity, a new vision, new eyes to see.
Things become easier as he proceeds, but the first step is the most difficult. To go out of the crowd is a drastic step. The world has lived for millennia in the same rut -- being born in misery, living in misery, dying in misery... at the most a few moments here and there of entertainment, not of ecstasy.
Entertainment is not ecstasy, entertainment is just an opium. You become so absorbed in looking at something -- a movie, a circus, a football match, a boxing competition -- that you forget yourself and your pains. Entertainment is a way of forgetting yourself and your misery. It can be only for a few moments; again you will be back. And your pain is not going to forgive you so soon. You deceived it -- it is going to be revengeful. So after each entertainment you will fall into a deeper ditch of darkness and misery, just to compensate.
But this has been the way the world has lived. Only once in a while somebody has rebelled against this whole order. It needs tremendous intelligence.
I am going on a world tour....
I am aware of my people who have already taken the first step; they have already separated themselves from the crowd. They are no longer Christians, no longer Jews, no longer Hindus. They have done a great job, something rare, something unique -- never done by such a vast number of people before.
There are only two ways: either they should come to me... which the vested interests are going to make more and

more difficult. THey would like to isolate me from my people -- they have already started doing that. I have my own way to respond to their fascist strategy.
Rather than calling people to myself, I will be going to my people.
Yes, it is true, the thirsty have always come to the well; but it is an old proverb, it is not contemporary. Now you can have water coming to your home, wherever you are. Of course in ancient days the well could not go to the people, but now tap water can reach everywhere, anywhere. And I am absolutely contemporary, so I say, for the first time the well will go to the thirsty.
This is the only possible way to prevent governments, religions, the political parties from preventing my people reaching me; I will be moving around the world. This way I can reach more people, new people also who may not have come to me, who may not have ever thought to come to me. There are millions of people who love me, who are in deep sympathy with me, who would like to be with me but circumstances prevent them. Their commitments to their families, to their countries, to their professions prevent them. And there is also something more fundamental than all these things.
That is, the negative person is always very active, articulate. Just a single negative person will make so much noise and so much fuss that he may create the illusion that many people are negative.
Why does the negative person make so much fuss, so much argument? Why is he so loud? Ordinarily one would think that the negative person would be inactive. That seems to

be in tune with negativity. But it is not the case. There must be some reason behind it.

The reason is, the negative person is afraid of his own negativity. If he remains silent his negativity is going to burn him. The negativity is part of death, destruction; if he remains silent he will shrink and die within himself.

To avoid this death he jumps, he runs here and there, he shouts loudly; he makes noise and he protests, argues, and almost creates single-handedly a phenomenon that makes it appear to the onlookers as if there are many people who are negative. He is simply trying to save himself from his negativity. He is vomiting it, he cannot keep it inside -- it is fire.

The positive person who loves me, who is sympathetic, who dreams one day to be with me, remains silent because love is something which one wants to keep in the secretmost part of one's heart. Love is something that one does not want to shout about. In shouting it will die. In making a fuss about it, he will kill it. It has to be protected; it is a very delicate phenomenon. It has to be kept silently within, so that nobody knows about it.

So there are millions of people who love me but have never said it to anybody. It is just their own private secret. And love grows in this way; the deeper you hide it, the faster it grows. Lovers know it -- not very clearly because their love is not of a conscious state, but they have a certain glimpse of it.

When you really love someone you cannot even say to the person, "I love you." The words seem to fall too short... in fact, seem profane. They don't express your experience,

they don't express your heart. They are dull and dead. They don't have the radiance, the fragrance of your love.
It is very difficult for the lover to say, "I love you." Words are miles away from what is growing in his heart. People start saying to each other "I love you" when love is dead. Husbands and wives say to each other, "I love you."
Dale Carnegie in his book, HOW TO WIN FRIENDS AND INFLUENCE PEOPLE, suggests that every husband should say at least three times a day to his wife, "I love you." Now, this type of nonsense can be written only by an American.
This man knows nothing about love -- he is simply a businessman. What he is talking is business, not love. He would have been far more successful as a salesman of secondhand cars rather than being a philosopher of love. He has never loved anybody.
But what he is saying makes some sense. When love dies you can express it. When it is alive, you can live it, but you cannot express it; your whole being may say it, but not your words. Your eyes may be full of it, but not your words; they are empty, and there is no way to fill them.
This is a tragedy in a way: that love cannot be said but hate is very articulate; that the best has to remain unexpressed and the worst is loudly expressed; that the best has no logic to support it and the worst has all the logic to support it -- it can argue, it can protest.
I am going around the world for all those people who are already with me; also for those people who would like to be with me, but their love is silent. I will also be going for those who have been sympathetic. Sympathy is not enough, but it is an indication that they can take a few steps and

become part of my lovers. Sympathy in itself is not enough, but it is a good indication of where the wind is blowing, the direction.

There are people who are just indecisive. They have not yet decided for or against. If I don't reach them soon there is a possibility they may decide against, because those negative loudspeakers are continuously bombarding their ears. All the yellow newspapers, magazines; the governments, the religious leaders -- they are all trying hard to convince them to be on their side. I don't need to convince them. I have just to be close to them, and that will do it.

They don't know me, yet without knowing me they have not decided against me. The moment they know me, there is no question of their deciding against me -- because they have been continuously fed arguments against me, and still they have remained undecided, open.

All these categories together can make millions of people.... And the strangest thing of all is that the people who think they are enemies of mine have no argument against me. They are fighting a losing battle. They know it. I have touched precisely their life nerve.

It has never happened in the past for the simple reason that religions have criticized each other, but their criticisms were always half-hearted. They could not go the full length, because to go the full length they would have had to criticize themselves too. A Hindu can criticize a Christian, but only up to a certain limit, because beyond that limit he himself is vulnerable.

For example, one very much respected Hindu saint, Karpatri, happened to travel with me once. We knew each

other -- he had even written a whole book against me. And he was talking about Jesus Christ's crucifixion.

He said, "According to Hindu philosophy, a man who is enlightened is finished with all his evil karmas; he cannot be crucified. Crucifixion is possible only if in your past life you have committed a very grave, evil act."

Within the Hindu framework it looks logical, but I asked him, "Would you like to stretch your logic a little bit more? Do you think Krishna was enlightened?"

He said, "Certainly." He was not even suspecting where I was leading him to -- because Krishna died while he was resting under a tree, and a hunter, by mistake, shot him with an arrow.

I said to him, "It is not a crucifixion, but Krishna dying from a poisoned arrow.... He may not have committed as grave a crime as Jesus Christ in his past life, but he must have committed something; all his karmas are not finished."

He had never thought about it, that his argument would spoil his own philosophy. So I said, "You should first look into your own home before you start criticizing anybody. I am not protecting Jesus Christ, I am simply making you aware that when you make an argument you should go the whole way, and you should look into your own religion to see whether there is something that goes against your argument. This proves it."

Religions have been criticizing each other. It is very easy because each religion is based on certain superstitions -- of course on different kinds of superstitions, so it becomes easy to criticize the other. But you should be aware that your own religion is based on superstitions, which may be

different but they also are illogical, as much as any other religion's.

It does not matter what form the illogicality takes; a superstition is a superstition. And every religion has, at its base, something that it cannot answer. So they have been arguing, but their argument was always half-hearted.

With me the situation is different. I don't have anything to protect. I don't have a religion, I can argue the whole way. They cannot use my argument against me -- because I have nothing.

That is their basic difficulty. Because I don't propose any philosophy, any program, they cannot fight against me. I can fight against all of them without bothering at all that my argument may go against myself, so that I have to stop at a certain limit. There is no question of that, because I don't have anything -- a proposal, a program, a philosophy.

This is making them almost mad. Otherwise, by and by they have become polite to each other, seeing that everybody has their loopholes. What is the point of bringing the loopholes of the other into light? -- because he will bring your loopholes into the light and you both will be exposed. It is better to be polite, nice to each other.

For the past two centuries they have started making some kind of synthesis of all religions. Even in the universities all over the world now they study different religions not as independent bodies of thought; they study them under one department, "comparative religion." So they can compare the best of all the religions, ignoring the loopholes.

Right now no Hindu is criticizing Mohammedans philosophically, no Jaina is criticizing Hindus or Buddhists. They have calmed down, seeing the fact that they are

sailing in the same boat. Making holes in the boat is going to be against each other, against all. It is better to keep the loopholes hidden, unexposed.

I don't have any religion so there is no question of any superstition, there is no question of any loopholes. I am not traveling with them in their boat -- I don't have a boat because I am not going to the other shore. This shore is enough for me. Only idiots think of the other shore, only idiots think that the grass is greener on the neighbor's lawn. To me this shore is enough, and the grass is green enough. If it is not, we will make it green.

My moving around the world will help tremendously to bring together these different categories of people who are somehow interested in me. It may also create new troubles for me from the vested interests; but I never think of them as troubles. The more they become afraid of me, the more they are losing ground.

And it is better to fight all over the world simultaneously than to fight in different countries at different times, because the fight is the same; why not make it a concentrated effort all over the world?

German sannyasins have been asking me, "Should we go to court against the government? -- because there is no reason, no law that says they can prohibit you from entering Germany. You have not committed any crime in Germany. There is no reason why a person who has never been in Germany should be prevented from entering. And to make a law out of it, to decide it in the parliament...."

I have been telling them, "Just wait. When I am in Europe then you go into the courts, because then the atmosphere will be more supportive from all the countries, the news

media will be more supportive. And it is absolutely illegal. You are going to win, but we want to win it in such a way that it becomes a precedent so that no other country can do it. Otherwise they can start doing it in every other country to prevent my movement; I will not be able to travel.

"But let me come to Europe, and then make a really great attack on the German government, that it is against the constitution, against human rights that an absolutely innocent person who has never been on your land should be prevented from entering."

The reasons that they have given are so bogus. The reason is -- one simply wants to laugh at the stupidity of your great politicians -- the reason the parliament has given is that I am not going to be of any help to Germany, why should I be allowed in? But if this is the case then it should be applicable to everybody who enters Germany, to every tourist. If this is a crime -- that I am not going to be of any help to the nation of Germany -- then all tourists should be prevented; then nobody should enter Germany! And the people who are living in Germany, if they are not of any help to the nation of Germany, they should be turned out. This is a strange reason that they have provided. No court can accept it. They may start bringing other barriers to prevent me -- and it will be a good battle, a good challenge. We have to fight now worldwide.

We have to make the movement a household name around the world. It is already a household name, but we have to get sannyasins, lovers, sympathizers from every house, so the fight can be from the basic unit of society, the family. The world is not ready, but a part of the world -- the cream, the young and the intelligent -- is absolutely ready. The

moment they heard that I am going for a world tour... immediately I received invitations from Greece, from Italy, from Spain, from Portugal, from Switzerland, from New Zealand, from Austria, from Australia, from Costa Rica, from Paraguay, and from many more other countries. Even three governments have invited me, knowing perfectly well that America is against me and is pressuring governments that I should not be allowed there. Three governments have been courageous enough.... And those countries are not rich -- poor countries, South American countries. But they want to show to America, "You don't have the monopoly over the world."

So going around the world will help us to find who is our friend and who is not. And my own experience is that one of our friends is equal to one hundred enemies... because they don't have anything, just old, rotten ideas which are out of date. Just a little push and they will fall apart.

They are fighting for the dead.

We are fighting for the unborn.

And the decision of existence is always for life.

Question 2

BELOVED OSHO,

SOME PEOPLE ARE INTERESTED IN YOU, SOME PEOPLE APPRECIATE YOU, OTHERS RECOGNIZE YOU, AND SOME FALL IN LOVE WITH YOU. PLEASE SPEAK ABOUT THE JOURNEY TO THE MASTER AND ALSO THE JOURNEY WITH THE MASTER.

It is natural that there should be many categories of people. And there will be categories within categories.

For example, you say, "There are some who are interested in you." This is not a single category, because there may be people who are intellectually interested in me because they feel a deep intellectual rapport, a logical affinity, but their hearts are not involved. They will remain only students, and to them I will be only a teacher, a philosopher, a thinker -- but never a master, never a friend.

There may be a few others who are interested just out of curiosity: "Who is this man? Why out of all religious people, is he being followed by millions, condemned by millions?" They may be just curious. Curiosity is of no spiritual significance. They will not even become students. It is a superficial thing, it never goes deeper than gossiping.

But there may be a group who is interested neither just intellectually nor just out of curiosity, but who feel a certain unknown, mysterious link. They are not aware of what it is, but there is a pull, a magnetic pull. These people have the possibility of becoming disciples. These people can find in me a master. That's why I said there are categories within categories; and it is natural that there will be a wide range of people interested in me for different reasons.

The second category you call the lovers. There are only two possible categories of lovers. One is the man, the other is the woman. The man first finds an intellectual conviction, a conversion on theoretical grounds; philosophically he wants to be absolutely satisfied. Logic comes first, then only can he open his doors of love. Logic is his god.

This type may enter into the world of love but can fall out of it; just as he can fall in, he can fall out -- because I am a continuously growing man. That is one of the differences to be remembered.

Buddha stops at a certain point when he is forty years of age, and then for the remaining forty-two years he simply repeats consistently the same discipline, doctrine, argument, which he had found at the age of forty. As far as I am concerned, he died at forty.

The forty-two years that he lived afterwards were posthumous, a ghost life. And certainly ghosts can only repeat; they are very consistent people. They cannot say a single new word. They are not inventive, they are not discoverers; they are just shadows of the past. And the same is the case with all the religious masters of the past. It is not true with me.

I will be alive to my very last breath.

I am not going to die before my death.

So there is every possibility that what I am saying today, tomorrow I may contradict. Nobody can expect consistency from me. You can expect growth, but to grow you have to be moving into new lands, into new discoveries, into new ideas; and naturally the past cannot contain them. You are continuously widening. The past was very narrow.

It is just like the river Ganges. It is born deep in the Himalayas. The place where it originates is so small that it seems unbelievable. They have made a marble face of a cow, and from the cow's mouth originates the Ganges -- just a small, thin current. And then it goes on gathering immense experiences in the mountains, in the forests, and

goes on becoming bigger and bigger, wider and wider. By the time it reaches to the plains it is oceanic.

And it continues, growing. New experiences... because it is one thing in the mountains, and it is a totally different thing on the plains. In the mountains there were trees, there were animals and birds, but no man. On the plains it finds a totally different world: millions of men, temples, worshippers; it goes on gathering experience. It goes on gathering new rivers, new waters. Great rivers go on merging with it.

By the time it reaches to the ocean... the place where the Ganges meets the ocean is called Gangasagar. Sagar means ocean. Before meeting the ocean, the Ganga itself has become an ocean. It is so vast that, from one bank, you cannot see the other side. In fact it has earned its meeting with the ocean. From a small current that falls from the mouth of a stone cow to Gangasagar, it is a totally different thing. The same is true with me. I am growing every moment. I am absorbing new currents, new vibes, every moment.

There is a tremendous harmony within me, there is no inconsistency within me. But to the logical mind it will be difficult to see the inner harmony. He will see only from the outside -- that I go on changing, that I am not consistent. So the man who has first intellectually convinced himself that he is in tune with me falls in love, but can fall out of love -- any moment.

One thing has to be remembered: when I say "man," I do not exactly mean masculine. A woman can be in the same category if she moves with intellectual conviction, and then enters into love. So it is not a differentiation between man

and woman as such, but most probably ninety-nine percent will be males in this category; perhaps one percent may be women.

The second category is of the woman, who falls in love first, and because she is in love she starts being converted to the ideology, to the philosophy. She has one thing -- that she cannot fall out of love just because I have changed some idea, I have said something which is inconsistent, because her love is not based on that. Her love is first, everything else is secondary.

It does not matter to her whether I am saying the same thing or changing it. Her love makes it possible for her to see the inner harmony which the intellectual man misses. So ninety-nine percent in this category will be women, one percent will be men. But whoever is in this category only falls in love and cannot fall out; it simply is irrelevant what I say.

Love is capable of seeing a harmony in all kinds of inconsistencies.

Love is vast enough to see contradictions as complementaries.

This is one of the most important categories. Those who are in this category are the most fortunate because nothing can distract them from the path. The heart only says yes once, and never moves away from it. The mind's yes is conditional; the heart's yes is unconditional.

The mind says, "Yes, because what you are saying agrees with my logic." Remember the difference: the mind says, "Yes, because you are agreeing with my logic, with my understanding, with me." The heart says, "Yes, because I

am agreeing with you, I have found where to dissolve myself, where to lose myself."
There are admirers. Most of them will remain only admirers. They will not come in contact with me in a living way. Their admiration is really hiding their jealousy.
I have known people who have come to see me... I could see immediately that their admiration is just a cover-up. One man had come to Manali -- a journalist, very intellectual, a nice person -- and he told me, "In such a small life you have become an international figure. I admire you."
I said, "You should think about it -- whether you admire me or you are jealous of me. Would you like to change places? Would you like to become an international figure? I am ready: I can become the journalist, you can become the international figure. I will be freed from all the trouble!"
He was shocked, but he understood the point. He said, "Perhaps it is jealousy; perhaps I am unable to say that I am jealous, and I am saying that I admire you."
People admire only those whom they would have liked to become. Their admiration is an ego trip.
So from this third category, ninety percent of admirers will belong to the jealous group. Only ten percent perhaps may not be jealous, may be simple-hearted, non-egoistic, and their admiration will be simply a heartfelt feeling. But that's where it stops.

They admire a novel of Fyodor Dostoyevsky, they admire a painting of Picasso, they admire the music of Mozart -- they admire me. But what can admiring the painting of Picasso give you? That's where it ends. It is a nice, heartfelt

feeling, you are overwhelmed -- but then what? Your admiration is not going to change your life, it is not going to become a transformation.
And what is your fourth category?

OTHERS RECOGNIZE YOU.

Right. The fourth category -- of the people who recognize me -- also consists of two types of people. One, which will be the majority.... It is again an ego number. By recognizing me they are trying to put themselves above me, to show that they understand me, that they understand my enlightenment, that they recognize me as a master.
But it is almost like a blind man recognizing a man with eyes just to deceive himself, just to create a belief in his own mind that he has eyes.
The major part of this category will be of that sort. I have come across such people. The king of this country recognizes me as an awakened being. But he thinks of himself as a man of great spiritual realization, which he is not. It is very easy for him to be supported by his puppets, his paid servants, who say, "Yes, you are a great spiritual leader."
But if he recognizes me as an enlightened person, he should come to see me at least. I'm a guest in his country and he should know the tradition of the East.
There is a story in the life of Gautam Buddha. He is entering Shravasti -- one of the most beautiful and rich cities of his days -- but the king of Shravasti, although recognizing Buddha as an enlightened being, refuses to

allow his prime minister to go to the gate of the city to receive him.

He says to the prime minister, "He is enlightened -- I recognize the fact -- but still he is just a beggar. And I am a great king: why should I go to receive a beggar? If he wants to see me he can come to the palace and ask for an audience."

The prime minister is as old as the king's father. He was his father's prime minister too -- the father is dead. The prime minister has tears in his eyes, and he says, "My son, you don't know the way of the East; you don't understand at all what you are saying. If you recognize him as the enlightened one, the question does not arise that he is a beggar, that he has to ask for an audience and come to the palace.

"These things show that you don't know at all what enlightenment is. This is absolutely ugly. And I cannot serve a man like you -- this is my resignation. Either you come to welcome Gautam Buddha at the gate, or accept my resignation. I cannot serve an idiot.

"This always has been so, that when an enlightened person comes -- and you recognize him -- then you have to go to receive him; otherwise withdraw your words that you recognize him. That is simply your ego -- you want to prove that you have such understanding, such wisdom that you can see that the man is enlightened. You have no such understanding, no such wisdom.

"And my tears are for your dead father, because Buddha used to come here in the time of your father, and I remember those beautiful days when your father would go to the gate -- not on the chariot but walking barefoot,

because Gautam Buddha is coming. Barefoot -- how can he wear shoes? How can he go in a golden chariot? And he would go and fall at the feet of the beggar."

The majority of people who say that they recognize me are, deep down, simply putting themselves higher by their recognition.

But there is a minority also which says, "We recognize... not that we know exactly what he is, but one thing is certain: he is something far above us."

This is a totally different kind of recognition. They are not putting themselves above, they are putting themselves where they are. They recognize the person's height, depth, wisdom, in a humble way. They can see that something has happened to him. They cannot make a clear-cut statement about what has happened, but something has happened and the man is totally different. He is no longer the same man as he used to be.

This happened to Gautam Buddha's father. He was very angry when Gautam Buddha came back after twelve years. The father was furious, very angry. Buddha was his only son, and his father was getting old; any day he could die. Who was going to succeed him? Who was going to be his successor in the big kingdom?

Then Gautam Buddha came with his begging bowl like a beggar, and the father was simply mad. He screamed, shouted, and abused Buddha. He said, "You betrayed me in my old age. I had depended on you. Rather than helping me, you escaped from the house without even asking my permission!"

Buddha listened to the whole thing. As the father cooled down, Buddha said, "You are right -- your son, Siddhartha,

has hurt you badly. On his behalf I ask your forgiveness. But please look into my eyes: I am not the same person."
And the father for the first time wiped his tears, looked into the eyes of Gautam Buddha, and he said, "My God, you are my son who had left twelve years before, but I can see that something has happened. You are no longer the same.
"Forget all my anger and forget all those twelve years that I have been continuously furious with you, because what you have gained is far more precious. I can see you have gone far away. I am old, but be compassionate enough to initiate me on the same path."
This is also recognition, but the recognition of a humble heart who can see the light, the depth, the faraway stars, but is not claiming, "I am above you and I can recognize you and I can certify you."
And you have asked about going to the master, and about being with the master.... What is the difference? -- is that your question?

THE JOURNEY TO THE MASTER, FINDING THE MASTER; AND ALSO THE JOURNEY ONCE YOU'VE FOUND THE MASTER, TRAVELING WITH HIM.

They are two steps of the same process -- going to the master and then being with the master.
Going to the master is far more difficult than the second step. The first step is always more difficult, because going to the master means leaving your ego, leaving your mind, leaving your expectations, putting everything aside, traveling very light, with no load, no burden.

All those things you have cherished all your life -- maybe for many lives -- and to detach yourself from them is difficult. And who knows? For whom are you leaving all your cherished things? You are risking for an unknown person. So the first step is difficult -- more difficult if you are going to the master with intellectual conviction, less difficult if you are going with a heart full of love.

The heart can do miracles. It can see where mind is blind, it can understand where mind fails. It has its own way of reaching to the mysteries of life. If you are going as if you have fallen in love, then you can leave everything.

Just by the way, all over the world, whenever a girl marries she has to go to her husband's house. Strange -- nowhere have they tried the other way, that the husband goes to the wife's house. But there is a tremendous wisdom in it -- because man thinks from the intellect. He may not be able to leave behind his family, his father, his mother, his brothers. That may be difficult.

But the woman loves from the heart. She can leave the father, she can leave the mother; she can leave everything of the past and go into the unknown with the man she loves.

So this is a folk wisdom prevalent all over the world. Logically the conclusion would have been different. Because man is stronger, he should leave his family and go to the girl's family -- she is more delicate. But no, that has not been done.

The same is true when you go to the master. If it is a heart-to-heart connection, you can leave everything aside, and even the first step becomes light, easy. Otherwise it is difficult, it takes time. For the intellectually converted

person it sometimes takes years. He may hang around, think again and again, go a little further and come back. The second step is not difficult. Once you have reached the master, for both -- those who have come from the mind and those who have come from the heart -- for both the second step is easy. The first step you were taking alone; the second step you are not alone, the master is already with you. In fact the second step is being taken by the master -- he simply gives you the appearance that you are taking it. To be with the master is in fact something totally different. The master is with you, and only when the master is with you, is there revolution. Just your being with the master will not do anything.

There are many people who think they are with the master, and nothing happens to them -- for the simple reason that the master is not with them; they are not yet ready.

But the last thing again to be reminded of: if a person has come to the master with love being the first thing and logic the second thing, he will find that to be with the master is absolutely easy. And the master will find that to accept the person to his innermost being is without any difficulty.

But the person who has come with logic -- the master has to wait. He has to see whether he drops his logic and remains with love; then only can he be taken with the master on the journey. Otherwise he can back out from any point, and the whole work and the whole effort would have gone down the drain. And no master wants to waste his time, his work, his energy.

Light on the Path

Chapter #21

Chapter title: Nature is not anguish, it is blissfulness
26 January 1986 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
SOMETIMES I REALIZE HOW MUCH I AM AFRAID OF THE UNKNOWN. I HAVE EXPERIENCED MOMENTS OF TOTAL TRUST AND MOMENTS OF BLISS.
WHAT ARE THE TRICKS OF THE MIND TO AVOID THESE BEAUTIFUL EXPERIENCES AGAIN AND AGAIN?

The tricks of the mind are very simple. One: when the moment of trust and bliss has passed, the mind starts thinking of whether it was true or illusory. However long you may have been in a blissful state, as you come out of it the mind questions it: "It is not reality because you are not always in it. So it was a dream, an illusion, a hallucination; it cannot be otherwise." The argument of the mind is based on doubt.
Mind is in such a low state -- so miserable, so suffering, so much in anguish -- that from that state, to conceive a moment of bliss is almost impossible.
We are brought up as mind -- and these divine moments just happen. In fact they happen only when we are not prepared. They come just like a breeze -- and they are gone. Before the breeze came there was suffering, anxiety; after it has gone there is again suffering and anxiety.

It is very natural for the mind to conclude that anguish is its nature; doubt is its quality, and these things that happen once in a while are not part of it. And they are not part of it. When they are there, they are really strong; but when they are gone, just to think that you had a moment of trust and love becomes impossible.

The mind is you, and this is your day-to-day reality; you have to face it moment to moment. And those rare moments are so rare, that compared to your mind -- standing in your mind with all your conditionings -- it is very natural that they will look illusory.

Almost everybody in the world gets those moments once or twice in life. But because the mind is such a long process, those moments are not only thought to be inauthentic, they are thought to be nonexistential... as if you have imagined them. They have never been there; it is just that your memory, tired of all the anguish and anxiety, has imagined them.

It is like when you are in a desert -- hot, burning, thirsty -- and you see an oasis far away. It looks absolutely real. You want it to be real, you cannot afford to think that it is unreal. You move towards the oasis and you find nothing there.

The same happens in such moments. Later on they go on fading; the mind takes its grip back and starts telling you that it is just a trick of your own memory: you wanted those moments -- the memory created them. But they have no reality; otherwise why have they gone? -- the reality is that which persists.

And mind's logic looks very valid.

Still, it is wrong. Those few moments are real -- and the mind is unreal. The mind has been trained, conditioned from the very beginning. It is a miracle that in spite of this mind you can get some of those moments.

The mind is not yours, it is a social product. It is society within you.

Those moments are yours -- society has not given them to you. And if you can put the mind aside, you will see: those moments are not momentary, they are your permanent reality. Mind was covering them; just in certain circumstances they make themselves felt by you. They are trying to assert themselves -- but the layers of the mind are thick and will not allow them to assert themselves.

So keep this in your consciousness:

Nature is not anguish, it is blissfulness.

It is not anxiety, misery, suffering:

It is love, it is rejoicing.

It is a constant celebration.

We come out of this nature, we are part of this nature; we inherit the same qualities in our consciousness. But the society does not want you to be rejoicing. Society does not want you to be blissful, loving, silent, peaceful. That goes against the structure of the so-called society that man has made.

It wants people who are full of anxiety, anguish, tensions, miseries, sufferings -- because they are the people who can be enslaved. They are the people who can be sent to war. And they are the people who can be goaded into any stupid job: Anyway they are suffering -- it does not matter to them what work they are put to.

But a man of blissfulness has his tremendous freedom -- it comes with it. A man of love cannot be enslaved. Freedom, love, joy create the real individual you are. They are the qualities you are made of.

And the society tries to hide that individual, repress that individual -- and creates a phony individual which it can manipulate. But nothing is perfect in the world. The society does everything, but still there are loopholes. There are moments when your real nature asserts.

Soon the mind catches hold of you, convinces you that it was illusory: "You are just imagining. It never happened -- I am the reality." So you have to be conscious of this strategy.

The mind is not yours, it is your enemy. Don't listen to it. Whatever it says goes against you. Listen to something that comes not from the mind -- that's why it looks as if it is from the unknown. Not only listen to it, but get more and more acquainted with it, allow it more and more space in you. Give it as many chances as possible.

This is the whole work of the seeker: what the society has made of him, he has to undo, and recover his natural being. And these moments are part of his natural being. Make them come more and more. Welcome them, relish them, and they will be coming more, and they will be staying more -- because after all they are the reality.

And if the mind becomes clear that it is not your friend, it stops creating a rift between you and your real nature. A day comes when the mind simply drops because now its function is no longer there. And then your life -- those twenty-four hours a day -- are of love, are of peace, are of silence, are of great joy.

Mind is the worst creation that society has put in every individual.
People ask me why I am against society, why I am against religions, the status quo, the establishment. I am against them because these are the people who have been destroying millions of people for thousands of years, giving them a mask and telling them, "This is your real face." And millions have lived on the earth and died without ever encountering their own face. They have not known what they were supposed to be; they have not known what potentiality they have to actualize. They have not known that they are part of an ecstatic existence -- not part of a rotten society.
So pay more attention to those moments, and don't pay any attention to the mind. And slowly the mind will become weaker, because it is unnatural, forced; it has no roots in you. And that which is natural and has roots in you will come up automatically; just the mind has to give space.
Neglect the mind.
Ignore the mind.
And it becomes a tremendous meditation.

Question 2
BELOVED OSHO,
IS IT NEVER A VIOLATION TO GAZE INTO YOUR EYES? SOMETIMES IT FEELS LIKE AN INTRUSION, AND I PULL MYSELF BACK -- EVEN THOUGH I WOULD LIKE TO JUMP RIGHT IN.

It is a strange phenomenon.

The psychologists who have been working on it have come to know that if you gaze into somebody's eyes for more than three seconds, he will feel offended. Just to have a look and go on your way is acceptable, but to look more than three seconds means you have taken a certain interest in the person, and it is an intrusion. It is interfering with his very private world. And the eyes are the most living part of his body, and most expressive part of his body.

A man can look with lust in his eyes, a man can look with anger in his eyes, a man can look with sadness in his eyes, a man can look with all kinds of emotions. The eyes are very sensitive. So in the society it has not been thought right.

But to be with a master is to go against the society. And looking at the eyes of the master is neither lust nor anger not sadness; it is a pure looking.

Secondly, the master is there to be available to you. There is no question of intrusion, you cannot interfere.

The master has no secrets to hide from you, no private world of his own that he would not like anybody to know. He is an open book -- you can read it from the first page to the last. And his eyes are also different from other eyes. The people who have known nothing of meditation cannot understand that eyes can be just a mirror, not projecting anything -- no emotion, no sentiment. And in a mirror, what you see is your own reflection.

The master's eyes are empty. You can jump into them without any question, because the whole world of the master and his friends is a world apart. It does not belong to the ordinary world.

I myself forget to blink if I am involved deeply in talking to you. Then the very natural process slows down... long gaps. And the eyes are the most significant contact points. So there is no question of fear as far as I am concerned.
My eyes are your eyes. And finally I would like that when I am gone, your eyes become my eyes. But this will be possible only if you have nourished a certain deep relationship with those eyes.
Somebody was asking me, "Now that you have allowed freedom to sannyasins not to compulsorily use red clothes or mala -- it is up to them -- how are we going to identify them?"
I said, "You don't be worried -- my people will be identified not by their clothes and by their mala, but by their eyes, the way they talk, the way they walk, the way they behave. I am spreading myself into my people."
So there is no problem in it.

Question 3
BELOVED OSHO,
BEING HOMELESS, THE CARAVANSERAI IS FINALLY AT HOME. I LOVE THE MOMENT-TO-MOMENTNESS OF MY LIFE THESE DAYS. I'M SO BEAUTIFULLY SURPRISED! WHAT ELSE DO YOU HAVE UP YOUR SLEEVE?

Don't ask that! -- because if you know beforehand you will miss the joy of being surprised. I certainly have many things up my sleeves -- that's why I keep them closed; nothing comes out!

But it has been really a great experience living moment to moment, not being certain of the next moment. Life is such. Having no home brings you to a great truth: there is no home and there is no certainty about the next moment. Everything is possible.
These few months have been very beautiful. It was a practical exercise of what I have been teaching to you. And I have many more things in my sleeves.... You will come to know at the exact time!

Question 4
BELOVED OSHO,
FROM BIRTH ONWARDS, TIME SEEMED TO ME TO GO FASTER AND FASTER. BUT SINCE WE LEFT AMERICA, JUST OVER TWO MONTHS AGO, IT FEELS TO ME LIKE WHOLE LIFETIMES HAVE PASSED. OSHO, WHAT HAVE YOU DONE TO TIME?

I have not done anything to time! -- but you have realized a certain quality of time. When you are in a certain stable situation, you will feel the movement of time differently, on two counts. One is that when you are in that false, permanent state, time will go slower, that is your feeling. But when that state is no more, remembering it, you will be surprised that it looks as if time went fast.
And when you are in a state of moment-to-moment living, time may feel just the opposite of the first: it will look as if it is going so fast that you cannot believe it. But looking backwards, it will look as if lives of time have passed -- and perhaps only months have passed. This is part of the

relativity theory of Albert Einstein, and I feel that he has come very close to the truth.

I have not done anything to time; just the situation from being in a commune which looked stable -- everything unchanging, tomorrow was certain, it will be just like today -- the time moved slowly. But looking backwards you will be surprised at those four and a half years, just how long they were.

And when the commune is dispersed and there is no home, each moment has got a tremendous reality, because the next moment nobody knows what is going to happen. So you start living in the moment, and when you live in the moment, it is big, it is deep. Moment to moment it will look as if you are living a long time, but looking backwards you will be surprised that you have been in this position only for two or three months.

What has happened? When you feel a kind of permanent state, you don't go deep into the moment. You just touch the surface and move on to another.

When you are living moment to moment, you have to go deep into the moment, live it totally, squeeze the whole juice of it, because the other moment may not be there -- this may be the last moment. In this way you make time a tremendously deep phenomenon, but when you look backwards, you will not think that it was a long time.

Albert Einstein was asked again and again about his theory of relativity, and he used to give this example: If you are sitting on a hot stove, time seems to be too long; and when you are sitting with your girlfriend, time seems to be too short. The whole night has passed and you wonder -- how

quickly! Time is the same -- just our attitudes, our experiences change the perspective.

And being homeless is a great experience of freedom, of no boundaries, of no shelter, of no security. The home is, on one hand, a cozy place, secure, safe; but on the other hand, it is a kind of imprisonment. And you have to make so many compromises to be in the home, with the wife, with the children, with the parents -- everything. You are not free; you have compromised on so many things, you cannot feel that you are yourself.

Homeless, you are yourself: no compromise, no security. And in fact life is insecure -- that's a reality. It is not safe -- that's a reality. Whatever you do is not going to help you.

I am reminded of a story.... A king was very worried about security and safety. He made a special palace with only one door so nobody could enter. And at the door there were guards: guards upon guards. There were seven lines of guards, so nobody from among the guards could do anything.

One of the neighboring kings heard of this; he came to see. He loved the house, and when they were departing, the visiting king said, "I would also like to make such a palace -- this is really safe, secure." At that moment a beggar sitting by the side of the street started laughing.

Both kings asked, "Why are you laughing?"

He said, "It is a long story, but to cut it short I will tell you the most essential part of it. I was also a king once, I was also worried about safety and security. Then I lost my kingdom and I lost my home, and since then I have been a beggar, and I am not worried about security or safety. By being a beggar I found what I was missing in being a king.

"And thirdly, I have a suggestion for you. Your palace is beautiful -- I have been watching it being built; you have made every possible effort to make it absolutely safe -- just one thing is wrong with it."

The owner of the palace asked, "What is that?"

The beggar said, "You do one thing: you go in and tell your people to remove the door, and make a wall. Then you will be absolutely secure, one hundred percent... because these seven lines of guards are not one hundred percent sure."

The king said, "You seem to be mad! If I enclose myself only with walls -- no way to go out, no way to come in -- it will become just a grave."

The beggar said, "That's what you have made it -- a grave with a door, nothing much. Just look at me: there is no grave. And I am happy that I lost my kingdom and I lost everything that I had, because it was hiding my moment-to-moment reality from me."

Life is unsafe, insecure -- you can die any moment -- so why be worried about it? All that you need is to live as totally as possible while you are living.

There are people on the earth -- gypsies. That is a strange group that never makes a home. It is always on the move, lives only in tents, and absolutely free. Whenever it wants to change the city, it starts moving its tents, bullock carts. In my village many gypsies used to pass, and I had asked many of them.... You may be surprised that gypsies are Indians; eighty percent of their language is Hindi, so it was not difficult to talk with them. They became known as gypsies because first they went to Egypt, and from Egypt they spread into Europe. From "Egypt" they got the name "gypsies."

I used to ask them, "Why don't you stay in one place? What is the point of troubling yourself by continuously moving?" They all laughed and they all said, "You don't know the beauty of movement. When the river is flowing, it is alive. But a tank is dead -- it is stable. The river does not know where it is going -- that is its surprise... moment to moment the new. Why get caught up with the old?"
All the governments have been trying to provide them with houses so they can stay in one place, so there is no need for this constant movement. But they are not willing. It seems that, in this movement, they have known a certain beauty, a certain freedom.

And I was surprised: they are the most strong people. Their women are so strong, you cannot believe it. All their business is done by their women -- their women will sell things on the market. And if you even ask the price of a knife, you get into trouble!
The gypsy will say, "Five rupees." Naturally, you have to give some offer. You say, "Two rupees." She says, "Okay, take the knife." And if you don't give her the money, she will take hold of your hand -- and the gypsy woman is so strong that even a man will not be able to get rid of her. And they are so beautiful! I have seen so many women, but no comparison with gypsy women. They are beautiful, they are strong; and the men are beautiful, they are strong. Perhaps their continuous wandering, facing new difficulties, new challenges, has created a certain stamina which people living in houses in one place -- being a clerk in the office -- have lost. These gypsies don't want to lose it, and they can see the difference.

Losing the home... it is a beautiful experience to be homeless, because all the animals are homeless, all that exists is homeless. Only man has created out of his cunning mind some safety measures, which don't help -- they simply make him weak, they make him ugly. He is in constant paranoia; and to get rid of that paranoia brings a new upsurge of energy.

So I am in favor of going around the world, moving, so you forget the whole idea of a home. You start having the freedom of a homeless person, and you drop the idea of safety and security... because they don't exist: they are just fictions.

Question 5

BELOVED OSHO,

YOU ALWAYS SAY THE TRANSCENDENCE OF SEX FOR MEN MAY HAPPEN AT THE AGE OF FORTY-TWO. I HAVEN'T HEARD YOU GIVE AN AGE FOR WOMEN. IS THERE ONE?

It is exactly the same -- forty-two. If everything goes naturally -- if the girl is allowed freedom when she becomes sexually mature, and is not hindered by any law or society to change her partners, so she lives only through love -- then the age will be exactly forty-two.

There is no difference in men and women. Recently they have come to discover that even men have a monthly period -- although, because there is no outward sign, for centuries nobody has thought that men could be having a monthly period.

If a man keeps a diary, and notes every day what his overwhelming mood was -- sad, indifferent, happy, blissful, angry.... If he just keeps the diary going for twenty-eight days, then a second month, then a third month, and then compares them -- he will be puzzled: There are three, four or five days, which are similar in all the three diaries, when he is angry, miserable, sad, destructive. Those are his periods.

He does not have any physical symptoms -- that's why, for centuries, nobody bothered -- but he has certainly a period. The symptoms are more mental, and the reason is clear: the woman is more body, more earthbound, and the man is more mind. But the man will have the same kind of trouble as the woman has. Every month, after twenty-eight days exactly, it will be repeated.

And if you have taken note of one year you will be surprised that it was not that you were simply angry, miserable, suffering, ready to fight with anyone; it was a certain period that you were going through.

Men and women both become sexually mature nearabout the same age; that is fourteen. Then the transcendence cannot be different; it will be forty-two. But these times are dependent on the natural course. If the man has repressed his sex, then forty-two will not be the end of it, then he will continue up to his grave. If the woman has not been fully and totally in it, then forty-two will not be the time. Otherwise, at forty-two her monthly periods will disappear and her sexual desire will disappear.

Man and woman are made of the same fabric, the same structure, the same biology. The only difference is, man is the positive pole of the energy, and woman is the negative

pole. And this is one of the reasons why I am against homosexuality or lesbianism... because two homosexuals are both positive poles. Perhaps AIDS is just an outcome of these two positive poles.
You cannot create electricity with two positive poles; neither can you create electricity with two negative poles. That opposition of negative and positive is absolutely essential. It is not a contradiction, it is complementary. And when the negative and the positive meet with deep love, there is every possibility that it will become a further step in their spiritual growth.
And forty-two years is enough time to experience what the body can give, and then to go beyond it. A natural urge will be there... if the body can give this much, there must be some way to get more.
Orgasm is the first experience of samadhi. It is far below it, but still, a first step.
And if you miss the first step, you will miss the whole ladder.

Light on the Path

Chapter #22

Chapter title: The real remains silent
26 January 1986 pm in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
IN YOUR EXPERIENCE, IS THERE ANY CONNECTION BETWEEN THE QUALITIES OF THE INVENTED SELF, AND THOSE OF THE REAL SELF?

IS THE EGO LIKE A SHADOW OR A DISTORTION OF THE AUTHENTIC BEING; OR IS THERE A TOTAL DISCONTINUITY? LOOKING BACK, DO YOU SEE ANY TRACES IN THE ONE YOU ARE NOW OF THE MAN YOU ONCE WERE?

The ego is not a shadow of the self, because in even being a shadow it will have a certain reality, a certain connection with the real self. It is not a distortion of the real self either, because the self cannot be distorted; there is no possibility of that.

The ego is simply false, a substitute created by society to give you a feeling that you have a center, that you have a self, that there is no need for any search -- you have already got it. To prevent you from reaching the real self, this is the most cunning device. It is completely made up -- from the very beginning, the child is being fed with things which will make its ego. They will appreciate you, they will say you are beautiful, you are good, you are nice -- but only when you don't assert your real self. You are obedient. That word is very central in creating the ego. Obedience means that whatever your parents are saying you have to listen, to follow; you are not to listen to any voice that is coming from your own being. In the beginning that voice is there; till the ego is strong enough you continue listening to your inner voice.

Obedience is the method to kill your inner voice. Hence all the societies, all educational systems, all religions praise obedience.

The biblical story in this reference has to be remembered: Adam and Eve are not punished because they have eaten

the fruit of a tree; they are punished because they have disobeyed. They did not listen to God, they listened to some other voice. This is their great sin, the only sin. And they are thrown back out of the garden of Eden for a simple thing -- that they have disobeyed. It seems that people have not paid enough attention to how all the religions depend on obedience.

They may call it different names -- belief, surrender, trust, faith -- but look into all these words: they are simply saying one thing, that you have to follow the dictates which God has given. And they have the holy book and they have the messiah and they have the prophet; now you need not listen to any voice -- particularly your inner voice. That will be again committing the same sin.

The story uses the serpent to persuade Eve, but that is just a metaphorical way of saying it. The reality is that because God has prohibited them from eating from the tree of knowledge, he has already created a great curiosity in Adam and Eve. He could have created it in any children -- there was no need of any serpent.

And this is the religious condemnation of woman. They never forget that the woman should be condemned. In every story, in every holy scripture, it is the woman who hears it -- the serpent talks to the woman. But to me it has a great psychological significance: the woman can hear the inner voice more easily than the man, for the simple reason that she is not too hung up in her head. She still lives in her heart. It is not a condemnation of the woman, it is really a compliment -- she has more capacity for inner growth than the man; she can hear her heartbeats more clearly than the man can.

But a strange thing is that all the religions are founded by men -- a woman is not respectable enough to found a religion. And when a man founds a religion, it is going to be intellectual; it cannot be of the heart.

There is a beautiful story I have always loved.... One of the great women of the world was Meera. She was only four or five years old when there was a great procession, a marriage procession. She asked her mother, "What is happening?" The mother explained, and the little girl said, "When will I be married?"

The mother said, "These are not questions to be asked! You are too small."

Meera said, "I may be too small but I have already fallen in love."

The mother said, "What do you mean?"

She said, "In the temple, when I go with you -- the statue of Krishna is so beautiful. I have fallen in love with that statue; so whenever you want me to be married, marry me to that statue."

The mother said, "You are just mad! Just go out and play." She did not take it seriously.

Meera belonged to a royal family. She finally married into another royal family, but she did not forget to take a small statue of Krishna with her.

The man she was married to must have been a very compassionate man. The first night, when he was going to meet his wife, he heard her talking, so he looked in through the window. She was sitting before the statue of Krishna and saying to him, "My lord, so finally I got married to you!"

It was a shock. Meera was an immensely beautiful woman... but the husband was certainly of great understanding. He turned back, he did not go into the room -- Meera remained a virgin. And just to avoid embarrassment, he went to war as the commander in chief. He won the war, but he died in it.

Meera left the house with the statue, singing and dancing in the streets. People thought she had become mad because of the death of her husband. But she would show the statue to them: "My husband cannot die, my husband is always with me. And the one who has died, he was never my husband." She became famous. I don't think anybody has sung such beautiful songs, danced so beautifully, so ecstatically.

She reached the birthplace of Krishna.... And that is the point I want to be emphasized: at the birthplace of Krishna there is the biggest Krishna temple in India. The priest of the temple had taken the vow of celibacy, so no woman was allowed in the temple.

A guard was standing there with a naked sword to prevent women. But when Meera came dancing, ecstatic, he forgot why he was standing there, and she entered the temple. She was the first woman to enter the temple in the forty years since that man had become the priest.

The priest was worshipping Krishna. He could not believe his eyes; the things he was holding in his hands for worship fell on the ground. He was really angry. He said, "Woman, you have some nerve! Everybody knows -- nobody who is not a man can enter this temple. You have destroyed my forty years' austerity!"

And Meera laughed, and she said, "I was thinking there is only one man, and that is Krishna, and we are all his lovers;

we are all women. I am glad to see that there is another man also in the world!"

The way she said it just penetrated the man's very heart. He fell at her feet to be forgiven. He said, "I have never thought about this -- what I said is simply absurd. Only Krishna, only God, is the man -- we are all his lovers; naturally we are all women. You are right and I was wrong."

Meera's saying that only the woman has a heart-to-heart contact with the divine is of great importance.

But all the religions are founded by men. They are great intellectuals, philosophers, theologians; they spin great, complicated theories -- but nothing in them gives the sense that they have experienced. They are only thinking, they are not living.

To think is a very superficial thing:

To live is the deepest.

And love is the way to go deeper into it.

But the man-dominated world has made everything heartless, stony. They can be of great use if they use their intellect only for the objective world, and leave the subjective world to be led by women.

So this is what I take from the story of Adam and Eve. I don't think it is an insult. It was intended that way: man is such an intellectual giant that the serpent will not be able to persuade him, the woman can be easily persuaded. And once the serpent persuades the woman, then the woman can persuade the man. But to me it is a compliment that the woman was the first to disobey.

To me, disobedience is the beginning of destroying the ego. Obedience is the matter ego is made of. The parents will say, "Obey," and whoever obeys is appreciated.

In my family there were so many children. My father had brothers and sisters, and most of the sisters used to come and visit with their children, and uncles were living together, so it was a big, fifty-member family. And they were always praising someone or other.

I told my grandfather, "Sometimes you have to praise me too."

He said, "You? For what?"

I said, "For my disobedience. You praise these children because they obey you. Indirectly you are simply praising yourself. If you have the guts to praise, praise me, because I disobey you. And on any point where I have disobeyed you, I am ready to argue that I was right and you were not."

He said, "This is strange! This is the first time I have heard somebody asking to be appreciated for his disobedience."

I said, "If there had been many people of the same type I am, the world would have been different. It is these obedient puppets who have created a phony world. And these puppets will create other puppets; and generation after generation the same spiritual slavery continues. You give it a good name -- obedience -- but it is spiritual slavery."

Disobedience is the assertion of individuality.

Disobedience is the beginning of rebellion.

The same is the situation in the schools; from the kindergarten to the university it is obedience that is continuously hammered into your minds. And it pays, too.

If you are obedient to a certain teacher, professor, you can trust that he will help you. He will give you a higher percentage for being present. If he has the paper in his hand, he may reveal the contents of it to you. If he is going to be the examiner of the paper, he will give you higher marks than anybody else -- because you have been obedient.

And this is the way that your ego is indirectly being created. In the army, obedience becomes the absolute thing. In political parties obedience becomes absolutely important. Wherever you look, your whole world is moving around a single word: obedience.

In one of my colleges, even the professor called me into his private room, and told me, "You are intelligent -- you could come first in the whole department, but you will not."

I said, "Why?"

He said, "Because you are continuously being disobedient -- not only to me but to all the staff members."

I said, "I would prefer to fail, but I cannot obey anything against my intelligence. And in the long run, I tell you that your obedient people will be lost in the crowd."

He said, "I can understand your standpoint, but you are not practical."

I said, "Because of this practicality you have destroyed all that is beautiful but non-utilitarian. Love is not practical, nor is intelligence practical. And all that is practical is absolutely mundane. At least I cannot be practical at the cost of losing my being. To me that will be committing suicide."

He was a good man. He said, "I will try to help you in every way, but what can I do about others?"

I said, "Don't be worried. If I can convince one man of your caliber" -- he was the head of the department -- "I will try to convince those people also. And to me it is not a question of bargaining, of compromising; it is not a business. I am not for sale. I can still maintain myself without all your education; in fact I will never use your education. But I cannot breathe a single breath if I feel that I have been against my own self, if for something small, I have betrayed my own being."

Up to my graduation I could never get a first class, and everybody was puzzled, the principals were puzzled: "What is the matter? Why are you not getting a first class?"

I said, "It is not a question of my first class; I am not getting first-class teachers -- they are all third-rate. They want to reward their puppets -- and I am nobody's puppet. They are all irritated with me, angry with me, and the examination is the only time when they can take revenge."

It was only for my master's degree that I could top the university, because my vice-chancellor was absolutely in agreement with me. The head of my department was absolutely in favor of me, and my other three teachers supported me in every way. They said, "It is a rare opportunity to find a person who wants to remain himself. We will help you."

One of my professors, Professor S.S. Roy gave me ninety-nine percent marks out of one hundred. He called me in, showed me the results, and he said, "Please forgive me -- I wanted to give you one hundred percent, but that would look like too much of a favor.

"I am sad that I am cutting off one mark just to say that I am not giving you any favor -- you deserve it -- but I

wanted to ask your forgiveness because I am feeling guilty. You have done such a great job on the paper. Perhaps somebody else may not have given you even third-class marks, because to understand it needs great intelligence."
There was a question whether the absolute god is perfect or not -- naturally, God has to be perfect. Two of the persons in the history of philosophy -- Shankara in India and Bradley in England -- have worked on the idea very deeply, and both have come to the conclusion that the absolute, the ultimate, or whatever name you give to it, is perfect. And Professor S.S. Roy's doctorate was on Shankara and Bradley, so he was deeply interested in the question.
In my paper I said, "The absolute cannot be perfect for the simple reason that if he is perfect then he must be dead: perfection means death. He cannot grow, he has nothing else to do. There is no point in being. Perfection simply means death -- and I don't want existence to be dead. And it is not dead, you can see all around: it is so living, so intensively alive, that I am ready to say that the ultimate, the absolute is imperfect because it is alive, it is growing. And it will remain always imperfect... moving towards perfection but never reaching it."
Only this much was the answer -- just a few lines. And S.S. Roy said, "You have destroyed my whole thesis! This is the first time I have thought in this way, because I was thinking in the terms of Shankara and Bradley, and they had impressed me so much that I never thought on my own."
The moment you think on your own, you come very close to truth.
All the religions teach, "Think according to Jesus, think according to Moses, think according to Krishna, think

according to Mahavira." No religion teaches you to think according to yourself. Theirs is the way of creating the ego. Ego is not a shadow, ego is not a distortion; it is a separate entity -- artificial, but created with such great ingenuity that it takes the place of the real. It covers the real, and befools almost everyone: "I am the real."

And the real remains silent; the reality is silent.

Unless you destroy this structure around the real, you will not be able to understand its silence, its sensitivity, its intelligence.

And that is my work. I call it deprogramming. I want to deprogram the whole ego structure and leave you alone with yourself -- wild, natural, in absolute freedom.

And that is true life.

Question 2

BELOVED OSHO,

SOMETIMES IT SEEMS AS IF YOU ARE MORE SURRENDERED TO US THAN WE ARE TO YOU. PLEASE COMMENT.

It is true.

I am not surrendered to you, to my people particularly. But because I have got rid of the ego, I am simply surrendered to the whole of existence -- and you are part of it. So it can be felt that I am more surrendered to you than you are to me.

It is a truth. But it should be so. I should be more loving to you than you can be to me. I should be more understanding towards you than you can be towards me. In every sphere you are still growing, still finding the way, struggling with

all the nonsense that has been forced upon you. And I am free of it. So my love will be purer than yours, my trust will be greater than yours.

It looks very absurd -- that's why the question has arisen -- because the disciple should surrender to the master, not the master to the disciple. The disciple should trust the master, not the master trust the disciple. But these things must have been said by people who were not masters; otherwise the master is in a state of surrender -- it does not matter to whom.

The master is in a state of love -- it does not matter to whom.

The master is simply a pure understanding.

You are searching for it -- he has found it.

But there is no need to feel any guilt that you are not more surrendered, that you are not more trusting. It is a natural thing; there is no question of guilt.

In my life I have trusted so many people, and so many people have deceived me. But my trust is the same. It is not that their deception has made me withdraw my trust in humanity. Even if the whole humanity deceives me, then too, I will be in a state of trust.

It has nothing to do with the person who deceives; that is his problem. And I don't have any condemnation either: he did what he could, and I am doing what I can. So do not even for a moment feel guilty that you are not up to standard.

You will be able to surrender to the master in the same way as the master has surrendered only when you become the master -- not before that. And that is the only thing every authentic master wants -- that every disciple of his becomes

a master and brings all his uniqueness and all his flavor to the phenomenon.

Question 3
BELOVED OSHO,
IN ALL THE BEST FOLK STORIES FROM AROUND THE WORLD, THE MAN OF POWER HAS ALWAYS SOUGHT GUIDANCE FROM THE MAN OF WISDOM.
WHY AND HOW DID THIS CHANGE?

First, these stories are not historical; these stories are our desires for how things should be. They are our hopes, our dreams, our utopias, that the man of power should seek advice from the man of wisdom. But it has never happened. Even in stories which seem to be historical it was not true. For example, there were great kings who used to come to Gautam Buddha for advice. But nowhere in any scriptures is it mentioned that they followed that advice; so it was really a strategy to gain more power over the people -- the people who loved Gautam Buddha. The king comes to Gautam Buddha's feet, touches his feet, offers his presents, sits with folded hands and asks Buddha's advice.... It is a strategy, it is pure politics.
He is not concerned with what Buddha is saying. He is concerned with what impression he is creating on the masses, because these masses have to be kept under his power. And if they see that their king is not only a political head but a man of wisdom, humble, then there is no possibility of revolution. There is no possibility of the

people becoming antagonistic to the king, because then that would be becoming antagonistic to Gautam Buddha.
So there are stories in the past when kings have come to people of wisdom -- but nowhere is it mentioned that the kings ever followed what they said. And the same thing is being done today. Tomorrow it will become a story, and then you will think....
For example, Indira Gandhi, the prime minister of India, wanted to come to me. At least five times she made appointments, and each appointment was canceled just one day before because of an emergency; she had to go somewhere. But this was not true, because after Indira had lost her power, her secretary came to visit the ashram.
She said, "It was not true. There was no emergency that meant she had to cancel the appointment. The reality is that to come to Osho is to take a risk, a political risk. Osho has no power over the masses. Hindus are against him, Mohammedans are against him, Jainas are against him, Christians are against him. To go to him can be dangerous; all these people can drop out of Indira's camp.
"Indira really wanted to come, so she again made an appointment -- but again, the same problem. Her cabinet did not allow her to reach you. And now that she is no longer in power, I was thinking, `Now she can come.' But now a new problem has arisen. Now to come to you is even more dangerous because to come back to power she needs the support of the people you are continuously condemning."
She came to Poona. Laxmi went to see her, and Indira told her, "There are so many appointments that it will be difficult to come."

Laxmi said, "I have not come to ask you for an appointment, but because you were so eager -- and five times you have decided to come -- I thought perhaps that now you are in Poona and the distance is only five minutes.... But we are not asking you to come; if you want to come, you can come."

She said, "It is very difficult, Laxmi. The time is too short and there are too many engagements." And then she went to Kolhapur, which was three hours away, to see the head of the Hindus, the shankaracharya, just to touch his feet -- because this shankaracharya.... Hindus have eight shankaracharyas for the eight directions, one for each. This shankaracharya was from the south, where Indira was going to fight a by-election to enter parliament, so he was immensely important.

And thousands of South Indians were in Kolhapur just to have a darshan with the shankaracharya. She was not interested in the shankaracharya, she was interested in the masses seeing that she is a religious woman, spiritual: that even though she has been such a powerful figure, she touches the feet of the shankaracharya. And she remained there for one hour.

The shankaracharya was in silence so he would not speak. But still she remained there for one hour so that thousands of people who were coming to touch his feet could see her sitting; photographs could be taken, publicity could be made....

Three hours going, three hours coming, one hour sitting: seven hours she took to meet the shankaracharya. In history it will be said that she was a woman who had power, but she always sought wisdom from wise people.

Now, both things are suspicious: first, whether she got any wisdom or exploited the wise people; and secondly, whether these wise people were really wise, or they were also just a different kind of power head.... They have their own power.

And you will be surprised to know that the shankaracharya had taken the vow of silence for that day only because Indira was coming. So he did not have to make any statement that might go wrong. Because Indira would ask for a blessing: she was standing for election in his own constituency. If he did not give the blessing and she came into power, that would be dangerous. If he gave his blessings and she did not become victorious, then people would think his blessings were impotent, meaningless.

While she was fighting for the election, Indira went to all the great, famous temples of India, to all the great saints of India. And I was the only man who blessed her -- and she had not come. I was the only public man who openly blessed her -- that she should win the election, that she was needed by the country, that not only should she try for the election, but once she was in parliament she should try to get back as the prime minister... because Morarji Desai had proved that he was absolutely useless.

None of the saints she had gone to said anything, made any statement. I was the only man who made a statement. And she had not come to me. She told her secretary, "Osho is really a courageous man, and I would like to thank him. But publicly I cannot do it. Thinking of him and myself, I feel so small."

The secretary came because she belonged to Poona. She told Laxmi that Indira had felt deeply hurt that she had

gone all over India, and even Vinoba Bhave -- who was her political master -- was also silent when she came, just not to have to say anything.

Do you think these people are wise? They are as political as anybody else.

And what wisdom did they give to her?

Only I behaved non-politically, because I understood completely that she wanted to come, but her situation, the people who surrounded her, the people on whom she depended for the election, would not allow her to come. She was almost a prisoner.

But that did not change my attitude. And when nobody had spoken for her -- this was so ugly.... I spoke -- in the same statement -- for Indira, who had no power yet, and against the man who had all the powers.

These folk tales are hopes that one day it may be possible. There is great understanding in them, but it has not happened. And I don't see it ever happening, because the man who is in power has to think of how to remain in power. And the wise man will say only the truth: whether it destroys your power or supports it is not his concern. Most probably it will destroy it, because where can truth and politics meet?

If truth and politics cannot meet, then it is almost hoping against hope that people of power will one day go to the people of wisdom.

Hindus will say that it was happening in ancient India -- that when Rama was in any political trouble he would go to Vashishtha, his spiritual teacher. This is true, but the problem is that whenever Vashishtha was in difficulty, he would go to Rama. And as I have looked deeper into their

lives, my finding is that Vashishtha was only a missionary who was spreading the gospel that Rama is an incarnation of God -- and for this he was paid well.

So what is on the surface is one thing, and what goes on inside is a totally different thing.

Now you can see that President Ronald Reagan goes to the pope -- and you think this is power going to wisdom? First you have to decide whether this pope has any wisdom. Secondly you have to decide what motive Ronald Reagan has for going to the pope.

His motive is to turn America into a very fanatic Christian country, for the simple reason that America has been fighting against Russia, and it is a losing battle. Russia has been gaining new lands, new people; America has been losing friends; it has not been gaining new people. Even inside America there are thousands of communists and thousands of communist sympathizers.

One of the problems has been that America has no philosophy against communism. Communism has a great philosophy, with great intellectual arguments, with a great humanitarian background. America has none. It does not appeal to the intelligent people in the world. All the intelligentsia of the world are impressed by communism, but not by America; so America has been in search of a philosophy.

And this is the effort: if Christianity... because half the world is Christian and half the world is communist -- the division is almost equal. If America can become the head and herald of all the Christian masses in the world, then Reagan could have a philosophy, a religion, a two-

thousand-year-old tradition and millions of missionaries, monks, nuns and Jesus Christ behind him.

This is the strategy behind his continuing to meet the pope. The whole idea is that if America can stand with Christianity, then America can give a better fight to Russia. But Reagan is wrong. Christianity has no argument strong enough to encounter communism.

The Christians may have a formal belief in Christ, in THE BIBLE, but it is not of the heart: it is a Sunday religion, a kind of sociality.

Communism is different. If Ronald Reagan really wants... then he should not have destroyed our commune. We would have given the answer, point by point, to every communist argument.

Christianity is old and rotten. To face communism, something is needed which is more contemporary than communism itself. Now communism is one century old; and within this century so much has been discovered that can be counted against communism.

For example, communism is materialism -- and now physicists say there is no matter. Matter simply does not exist.

Rather than going back to Christ, Ronald Reagan should have come to me. I could give him the idea that materialism could be thrown out completely, because modern physics has proved experimentally that there is no matter. So materialism has no base to stand on.

Modern psychology has proved that equality is nonsense: no two individuals are equal, so the very idea of all people being equal is not workable. And if you try to work it out

then you will have to force people; and every enforcement will be in favor of the lowest.

You cannot make an idiot into an Einstein. Even by forcing him, what can the idiot do? But you can force an Einstein to remain an idiot, or at least not to assert anything beyond the limits of an idiot.

Equality is possible only at the lowest denominator. But that will destroy the whole of humanity and all progress. So my proposal is not equality of all men, but equal opportunity for all men to be unequal, to be unique and to be themselves -- equal opportunity to Einstein and to the idiot. The opportunity should not be different. Now it is up to the Einstein where he wants to move.

Something newer than communism itself is needed; something higher than communism itself. But Ronald Reagan will go to the pope, for the simple reason that the pope has six hundred million Catholics.

I don't have; I have millions of enemies around the world. No politician can dare to come near me; if somebody comes to know that he has been to see to me, then his credibility, his respectability is finished. But they don't understand simple historical logic: that Christianity, which is two thousand years old, cannot fight with communism, which is only one hundred years old.

Communism can be fought by something which is absolutely new, against which communism cannot find any argument. But of course a man who brings something absolutely new will not have traditional support; he will not have millions of people and millions of churches. But only such a man has the potential to create the fire that can destroy communism completely.

So there have been politicians, people of power, who have been going to the wise. But that was also a part of their politics. It was not genuine search.
These stories are just hopes, beautiful hopes, which perhaps are never going to be fulfilled.

Light on the Path

Chapter #23

Chapter title: Cities have made the human being inhuman
27 January 1986 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
AS MOST PEOPLE IN MODERN EUROPE LOOK AT THEIR LANDSCAPE, THEY FIND THAT THE CITIES THEY LIVE IN VARY FROM INHOSPITABLE TO FRANKLY DANGEROUS; THAT THE JOBS THEY DO (IF THEY ARE "LUCKY" ENOUGH TO HAVE ONE) ARE DULL, BORING, AND MEANINGLESS; THAT THE RELATIONSHIPS THEY HAVE ARE TOLERABLE AT THE BEST, AND LOVE IS A RARITY; AND THAT THE FUTURE HOLDS VERY LITTLE TO LOOK FORWARD TO. HOW LONG WILL IT TAKE FOR PEOPLE TO REALIZE THAT ONE OF THE ROOT CAUSES OF THIS STUPID CATASTROPHE IS THAT THE SYSTEMS OF LIFE THAT THEY SO AVIDLY SUPPORT HAVE NO LEADERS WHO ARE CAPABLE OF BOWING DOWN TO WISDOM?

It won't take long for them to realize the catastrophic situation they are in.

There is a limit to everything. People can tolerate up to a point, but if it becomes a question of life and death, then there is a sudden outburst of intelligence in ordinary people. You would never have expected it.

The people who are in power are not going to the people of wisdom, ever. Power corrupts so deeply and gives such a big ego that even to ask advice becomes impossible.

The revolution is going to happen not through the powerful people but through the common people -- and they have tolerated enough. And it is coming to a climax. The climax is on one hand very painful; but on the other hand it is a new beginning, a fresh beginning.

It is true that people's lives are loveless. They don't have any joy in their work. They are bored, they don't feel any meaning in their life. They are just running like robots. Their cities are no longer places of beauty, and nature has been destroyed very deeply.

All these things together come to one point, the central point; and that is that the people have depended too much on people who have power. It has been almost a kind of slavery.

It is time to revolt and throw out these people who have power, and to destroy the whole system of power. There is no need for them, because they are not doing anything except destroying more and more qualities which make life worth living.

Secondly, people have to understand that the people they have been thinking are wise are not so. In fact most of their

misery is because of those "wise" people and the powerful people; they both need to be overthrown.
The common man has to assert himself and common sense has to prevail. It does not need great wisdom, it only needs common sense.
For example, people's lives are loveless -- there is no need to ask any wise man why, because they are the people who have made it loveless. Just common insight is enough.
Men and women are not naturally made to live their whole life together. It is not only a question of men and women; it is that the same thing continuously repeated creates boredom -- the same husband, the same wife, the same quarrel, the same argument, the same tantrum -- exactly the same! It goes on being repeated again and again. It destroys the very possibility of love. Instead it creates boredom -- it has created it.
The common-sense thing is that there should be no marriage and there should be no divorce. Any two persons loving each other can live together, that is their private affair -- nothing to do with society, nothing to do with the state. The law should not come between them.
There should be no promises except that, "We will love each other as long as existence allows it. The moment we feel that love has left -- that it is no longer there connecting us, no longer there nourishing us -- we have to part quickly, before it becomes bitterness, a quarrel. And we have to depart in gratitude, with all our heart's blessings full for the other -- that she or he will find a better man or a better woman." And boredom will disappear; life will become a series of excitements.

Boredom is in getting stuck at one point -- repeating, repeating, repeating. Joy is in exploration -- finding new people, new spaces. It is simple common sense.

People are bored in their job because they allowed others to decide their job; their parents wanted them to be a doctor, so they are a doctor. They never had any inner urge to be a doctor, and they never listened to their inner voice.

It is never too late; they can start listening to their inner voice. And it is better to drop a job and do the thing they always wanted to do. It may be a loss in salary; economically it may not be good, but spiritually it is going to take away the boredom. And what are you going to do with the money, with all the facilities that the job gives you, if you are utterly bored? It is better to be a beggar but not bored, than to be an emperor and be bored.

These are common-sense insights.

The cities are becoming bigger and bigger. The villages are disappearing, and with the disappearing villages the pure air, the unpolluted atmosphere -- that is disappearing. People should just see it; they should start moving towards the villages. They should start doing farming, gardening; and there are thousands of other things. It just needs a little courage.

The city has no future.

Small villages can convert themselves into communes, which would give them a new structure, which would make people free of children and would make the children free of parental power. And they could have more fresh food, fresh water, fresh air.

There were all running to the city for one thing -- because it gives money, and the villages cannot give money. Why

have villages been disappearing, and big, monstrous cities coming up? The reason is that everybody is after money, not understanding a simple thing, that money cannot buy anything that makes life a beautiful, blissful pilgrimage. It can buy many things, but they are useless if the man himself loses his soul.

If the cities disappear into villages, much of the pollution will also disappear. The cities are almost like a canceric growth, that goes on growing bigger and bigger. The people in power cannot do anything because their power needs money -- not love, not blissfulness, not joy -- just money.

And your so-called wise people are nothing but politicians in another garb of religious heads; their whole interest is also in power. It is a different kind of power, more subtle, but all the same it is power. They would not like the cities to disappear.

Their power depends on the boredom of man, his loveless life, his meaningless life, his anguish, because these are the things which bring people to their feet -- to the churches, to the temples, to the synagogues. They may say great things, but basically they don't want these things to disappear. If these things completely disappeared, churches would be empty and nobody would go to the synagogue -- there is no reason to go... you go to the physician because you are sick. There is a certain vested interest that the physician has in your sickness. I have heard of a young man who had just come home from medical college. His father was not feeling well. He said, "I would like to rest for a few days. And now you are back fully qualified... I am proud of you,

that you topped the university -- now you take care of the dispensary."

After three days the son came and told the father, "You must be proud of me! That old woman -- the richest in the city, whom you have been treating for thirty years -- I have treated her in three days. Now she is perfectly okay."

The father said "My God! She is the woman who has paid all your fees and all your expenses at medical college. She is also paying the expenses of your younger brother in college. You have destroyed half of my business!

"You idiot, don't you know that when a poor man comes you should cure him immediately, because he is going to be an unnecessary harassment. When a rich man comes, take time -- there is no hurry. If one illness disappears, let another appear. A really rich man should be a lifelong patient. This is a basic rule of the profession. You have learned medicine, but you have not learned the medical profession."

The priest has a vested interest in man's misery.

And it is really unbelievable, but it is the truth: the magistrate has a vested interest in criminals, the advocates have a vested interest in criminals. They are supposed to do justice, they are supposed to be fair; but basically their profession is based on these poor people. If everybody is a nice, good gentleman and there is no criminal anywhere, what are all your magistrates, all your jailers, all your advocates, and all your legal professionals going to do? They will have to commit suicide -- their whole profession will be gone.

The common people have to understand this simple thing. They should move back to the villages because money has

not given anything... more gadgets, but gadgets don't create love, don't create freedom, don't create joy. Go to the villages, make small communes.

And to work with nature is a healthy thing. All the jobs that the city provides are unhealthy, because people are sitting the whole day in chairs. Man is not made for that; his body is made for at least eight hours' physical labor. Basically he was a hunter, running after wild and fast animals. And that was his food. He managed for thousands of years, and naturally he had a certain health that modern man cannot afford. If you don't use a certain part of your body, that part slowly becomes useless; then you cannot use it.

People have to move back to the villages, to the forest, to the mountains. It will be a hard life, but it will be natural, it will be beautiful, it will have a joy. And they should make small communes, so love need not be a forced thing. Ordinarily marriage is nothing but licensed prostitution. This is ugly.

Except for love there should be no other thing between two persons.

In the villages, in the mountains, in the communes, the woman will have a similar kind of work to the man. She will not be financially dependent on man; she will be producing, she will be creative.

And let the cities die. It happened many times in the past -- it can happen again. There is no necessity for anything to live forever.

I have seen a few places in India.... In one place I was staying in a government guesthouse. Now it is just a small hill station, the population of the city today is only ninety. These are the people who serve the visitors, the tourists.

There was a time that the city had a unimaginable population, looking at today's population of ninety: it had hundreds of thousands of people.

It was one of the biggest cities, Mandu. And you can find the proof in the ruins. There are mosques where ten thousand people can pray together. There are caravanserai -- just ruins -- where thousands of camels could have an overnight stay. And if you look from the top, all over the mountain there are ruins as far as you can see.

I asked a man who was my friend and was living there... there is a great palace and other small palaces and a beautiful lake. I said, "What happened to the city? This big city suddenly disappeared without any war."

He said, "This city was the camels' route, and in that day camels were the vehicles that carried the goods from one place to another. So from Kabul to Indore this was the only route. Thousands of camels moved through here continuously, and the city was flourishing. But then things changed...."

The camel was found to no longer be an adequate means to take goods from one place to another, so bullock carts replaced the camel. But the route that goes through Mandu is a desert; only camels can go on that route, bullock carts cannot. They had to find a new route. Bullock carts were cheaper; naturally camels were abandoned. With their abandonment, the route that passed through Mandu was abandoned.

Mandu lost its source of money, and people had to go away. What could you do there? On that mountain you cannot grow anything -- they lived only on the constant traffic. Such a huge city simply disappeared! People left

their houses and moved to places where they could earn something.

It is only a question of a simple understanding: cities are now killing people with pollution, with AIDS, with other diseases. It will be good if people move into the open air, with nature.

And the needs of man are not so many, the needs of man are very limited -- just his ego has an unlimited desire for more and more and more. The ego has created the whole problem. And on the way it has destroyed many human qualities.

In a big city you are in a crowd, but still a stranger. And everybody is in such a hurry: everybody is running from job to home, from home to job, and it may be miles. He has to catch his train, his bus. Nobody has time for strangers, nobody even says hello to a stranger.

In a small village everybody is known to everybody else. Everybody is in some way related to somebody else. There is a friendship -- in a real sense a commune, because there is a communication. People are not islands. If somebody falls ill the whole village will come to enquire. If somebody is not in good enough health to work in the fields, then the whole village will help him. This is simply human. Because he has helped others, others will help him -- it is a simple phenomenon.

And with my idea of love not being a static thing, the village can become a paradise, self-sufficient. And man has to choose -- he has come to the point where he will have to choose: Do you want love? Do you want a meaningful life? Do you want blissfulness? Or you can choose to have dead gadgets, new mechanisms.

And the answer is simple. What will you do with machines? Man needs human energy.
I am not against machines. But I am saying that the emphasis should be on human relationship. Machines can be used if they are not against human relationship, if they are not against ecology. If they are against ecology, if they are against human relationship, then they are not to exist at all.
Neither the people in power are going to do it, nor are the so-called saints and wise people going to do it. They are both conspirators. They both depend on your pain, misery, meaninglessness. They cannot do anything.
They also depend on the industrialist, because in their elections the industrialist will be the one who will give the money. So they cannot go against the industries that are polluting the air, cutting the trees, destroying the ecology, poisoning the water, the rivers, the lakes, even the oceans. They cannot do it, because if they do it, their own money that they will need at election time will not be available.
For the first time the common man has to stand on his own legs and depend on his own common sense. And these are simple, common-sense things -- they don't need great wisdom.
This whole life on the planet can go through a great revolution without any bloodshed.
Just a pure understanding will become the revolution.
And if people start moving away from the cities, deserting them, they will cut the people of power off from their money sources -- because who is going to run their industries and factories? They will cut the power of the

religious heads -- because who is going to gather in their cathedrals and synagogues?
And my understanding of religion is that it needs no synagogues, no temples, no churches. It is a simple heart-to-heart communion with nature. You can sit by the side of a river and meditate, you can sit in the mountains and meditate. And as you become aware of the knack of meditation then you can continue to work and meditate. Then there is no conflict, and no question of time.
And meditation is neither Hindu nor Mohammedan, nor Christian. Meditation is simply a science. Just as science is not Christian, and science is not Hindu, and science is not Buddhist.... It would be a mad world if there were Buddhist chemistry and Hindu chemistry and Christian chemistry -- people would simply laugh because the laws of chemistry are the same.
The same is true about the inner science -- which has been known up to now as religion. The methods of reaching to your innermost center are scientific; there is no question of any adjective, they are the same. It is absolutely unnecessary to call them Christian or Hindu.
The common person has a tremendous power in his hands. If he moves into small communes, deserts the cities which are dying, which are nothing but citadels of crime.... If he moves away, he takes the power of the powerful and the wisdom of the so-called wise.
And it is beautiful to have a small commune where everybody knows everybody else, understands everybody; where everybody is ready to help, is always available in times when there is need.

In a city you are absolutely alone. You may be living in the same building and you may not yet have been introduced; in one building thousands of people are living. And the city life is so speedy that there is no time to sit and gossip, to play cards or to play music, or to have a communal dance. All those beautiful things have disappeared. In small communes we can revive everything that was of beauty.

I have been to aboriginal tribes... the whole day they will be working in their fields or in the mines. But by the evening, after their meals, they will all gather in the middle of the village with all their instruments. They will have music and they will have dance -- and it will continue late into the night.

It was so beautiful to see that they have not become mechanical. They do the work which is needed for their food; otherwise they enjoy their time. They will play cards... and in a small place, where maybe fifty people, a hundred people are living, they will all gather together gossiping. There is something human in it.

The city has made the human being inhuman.

But the revolution that has to come, has to come from the common people themselves. The powerful people -- whether in wisdom or in political power -- are too involved in this system. They cannot change it; they will go on making it grow. And the common man will be crushed -- he is being crushed.

Houses have become just boxes -- boxes upon boxes. They don't have the beauty of a house. They are no longer houses; the space has gone on shrinking. Small rooms which perhaps are not natural... they are claustrophobic. And every being, man or animal, has a territorial

imperative -- an area of big space around himself where he is totally free to move.

Scientists have discovered that the most difficult thing for animals in zoos is that they lose their territory. If you go to a zoo and see a lion, you will be simply surprised: he is simply going round and round, round and round in his cage. What is he doing? He is trying, by traveling so much, to deceive himself that he has his territory.

All the animals, lions... and we know about dogs because they are more common. You may never have thought about why they do it -- dogs will go on pissing on this pole, on that pole, on this stone.... If you watch, the same dog will do the same thing on the same pole, on the same stone every day -- because animals are very very sensitive in their smell. He is creating a boundary: "Beware, this area belongs to me!"

He is creating a fence of smell. You may not smell it, but other dogs smell it: it is dangerous to enter. And it has been observed that if another dog comes, he immediately stops at an invisible barrier and thinks twice, whether to enter or not. And the dog inside looks at him, but he is not agitated or ferocious or angry because the other dog is still outside his territory. One step in and he will go mad. He knows where the territory is, the outside dog knows where the territory is.

And in jungles, all animals make their territories the same way, and most of their territories are respected by other animals. But you put them in a zoo, in a small cage, and you destroy their freedom. Perhaps something of their soul is crushed.

What about man?

If all animals have a territory, a certain territory, a determinable territory -- if lions have only that much territory, all the lions -- then what about man? It is not possible that he has no territorial imperative. He also has it. But in the crowds of a city how can he manage a territory? And if he cannot manage a space around himself, perhaps he is losing something of his inner being too.
So it is not strange that when you go out of the city, in the open -- in the forest, near the ocean, or in the mountains -- suddenly you feel an expansion of being. That expansion of being is a very scientific phenomenon -- nothing poetic. It is your territory; there, you can have it.
The world is big enough still -- people can move. They have moved to the cities because they are center of money. If they understand only one thing -- that money cannot buy anything of value, and you have lost everything, running after money....
Go back! Go to the world where you belong -- to the trees, to the animals, to the rivers, to the mountains.

Question 2
BELOVED OSHO,
IS IT OKAY TO HAVE A SECRET?

It is a complicated question.
For a man like me it is not okay to have a secret. There is nothing to hide. Everything should be made available to people, everything should be shared. So the awakened person cannot have a secret.
But the unawakened person is bound to have secrets, for the simple reason that he is living in a mad world -- he has

not been able to raise his consciousness above it. If he opens his secrets to other people, they may exploit him, they may take advantage of it -- they are certainly going to take advantage of it.

So for the unawakened it is okay to have secrets; otherwise he will be creating so many troubles for himself that he may not be able to manage them.

Just one thing he has to remember: if he loves someone he should not have any secrets with the person he loves, because every secret is a barrier. If you love a person, then there should be nothing in you that the person is not allowed to know. Between the two of you there should not be anything private, secretive. That is part, an essential part of love.

But that is only between two persons who love each other. In love they have become almost one -- there is no question of keeping a secret. But to the world at large it is not needed to open your secrets. Nobody is asking, nobody is bothered; and why should you open your secrets? And your secrets will give them power over you.

The Catholic church has a tradition of confession: every Catholic has to confess to the priest what sins he has committed. This is a very cunning strategy, because the priest knows all your secrets, all your sins. You cannot leave the fold, otherwise he can expose you.

You have given your power into his hands.

Just a few months ago, the pope announced to the Catholics that one of the greatest sins is to confess to God directly. You have to confess through the priest, otherwise it is a sin. Why should it be a sin if somebody confesses to God directly? But the pope's concern is that if people start

confessing directly to God, then who is going to confess to the priest? It is embarrassing. And then the priest's power over people will be lost. So you have committed one sin; you are committing a greater sin if you confess to God directly. A mediator, a priest is an absolute necessity.

In politics it is an everyday affair. In India, the first prime minister remained in power long enough to know everybody's weaknesses, everybody's crimes; and he had maintained a file. That file was power: You cannot betray him, you cannot go against him; otherwise you will be in very great difficulty. He knows some secret that he can expose about you.

When he died, the file went into the hands of his daughter. That was her power; otherwise she had no power. She was not a politician; but even without being a politician she maintained a tremendous power -- more than her father. And the file went on growing bigger and bigger.

About every politician in India they had every secret. Whatever they had been forgiven for had been reported; it could be exposed any moment, and the man would be finished. They may have been chief ministers, they may have been governors, they may have been cabinet ministers -- but they were all puppets because of the file.

And you will be surprised that when Sanjay Gandhi, Indira's son, died in an accident just close to their house in an airplane, everybody rushed there. As Indira was informed, she rushed there. The most amazing thing is that she was not concerned about what had happened, how he died. What she was concerned about was: "Where are those two keys he was carrying?"

The son has died -- can you think of a mother asking about two keys that he was carrying? And first she got hold of those two keys; only then she did make other enquiries.
I have been told, those two keys were the keys to all the secret files against the politicians of India -- because that was her power. If those two keys are lost then it will be a difficult job -- first those two keys.... Perhaps one key was concerned with the files and the other key was concerned with the money they were keeping in hiding. And this was a constant fight between Sanjay and Indira: he wanted those two keys.
I don't know exactly, but people who knew their house and their inner workings say that he even slapped his mother once because she was adamant and would not give him those two keys. And finally she had to give them to him because he was creating too much trouble for her. Just to console him, she gave him those two keys.
And I don't see that she was very much hurt by his death. Perhaps deep down she wanted it. He was not the man she wanted to replace her; her elder son was the person that she wanted to take her place. But whoever had all those secrets would be the prime minister. This is how, for forty years, one family has been ruling the whole country in the name of democracy -- but it is really a dynasty. And if they go on keeping those secrets they may be able to continue.
So I will not say that you have to tell your secrets to everyone. In the first place, what is the need? But yes, if you love a person then don't keep any secrets. It makes you closer, more intimate.
But if you become awakened, enlightened, then of course you are available to all, with no secrets. You should be an

absolutely open book. Anybody can read it -- because now you exist for others, your own existence is fulfilled. And nobody can exploit you, nobody can take advantage of you in any way.
The enlightened person is in a position to open himself totally, but nobody else is in that position.

Light on the Path

Chapter #24
Chapter title: Sex and death: two poles of one energy
28 January 1986 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
I HAVE HAD A STRONG FEELING OF SEX AND DEATH OVER THE LAST FEW WEEKS.
IS IT NECESSARY THAT I UNDERSTAND WHY?

It is always necessary to understand how your mind is functioning, how your heart is doing, what is happening to your interior world. Trying to understand it will give you a certain distance from those things, and an awareness that they may be there but you are not identified with them. That is the great alchemy of understanding.
Try to understand everything within yourself.
In the very fact that you are trying to understand, you become separate from it; it becomes an object. And you can never become an object, you are always the subject; it is not possible to change your subjectivity into an object. So

that gives a good distance between you and your feelings, whatever they are. That is one thing.
The second thing: this distance will give you a possibility of understanding what is happening to you.
Nothing happens without any cause. And sometimes there are things which are very fundamental. For example, the question is one of the most fundamental questions -- the connection between sex and death. And if you can see it clearly, slowly the distance between death and sex will disappear and they will become almost one energy.
Perhaps sex is death in installments.
And death is sex wholesale.
But there is certainly one energy functioning at both corners. Sex is the beginning of life, and death is the end of the same life; so they are the two ends of one energy, two poles of one energy. They cannot be unconnected.
There is only one living being, the amoeba, which has no sex life; but then it has no death either. It can go on living for millions of years; it dies only accidentally. Death is not intrinsic, because there is no intrinsic sex. The way the amoeba recreates itself is very strange: it simply goes on eating, becoming bigger and bigger. And there is a certain limit at which it cannot go on becoming bigger; then it splits in two. That is the way amoebas go on growing. Both will go on living, giving birth in the same way, but there is nothing like sex in that life.
The point to note is, there is not any natural death either. They can live, given the opportunity, forever.
Death and sex remind me of one spider found in Africa, where death and sex come very close to each other. In man there is a distance of seventy years, eighty years; but in that

particular species of spider there is no distance. The male spider makes love only once in his life. While he is making love, the moment he comes to an orgasmic state, the female starts eating him. But he is in such an euphoria, he does not care that he is being eaten. By the time his orgasm is finished, he is also finished.

Death and sex are so close... but whether they are close or distant -- they are not different energies. So one can feel them arising together.

It is good to see them together, it is a great understanding -- because people don't see it. People are almost blind, they never connect death with sex. Perhaps it is an unconscious fear that prevents them connecting the two, because if they start connecting death with sex they may become afraid of sex itself -- and that is dangerous for its biological purpose. It is better for biology that they don't connect them.

It has been noted that whenever people are beheaded -- there are still a few countries where this happens -- the strangest thing observed is: the moment the man is beheaded, he ejaculates -- without exception.

It is strange, because while his neck is being broken, is this the time to ejaculate? But it is not within his capacity.... When death is happening to him, when life is leaving him, it is natural that his sexual energy also leaves. It was part of the whole phenomenon. There is no point in it remaining in his body.

The question is significant. It does not mean that you are going to die. It simply means your sexual energy is coming to its highest peak; hence you are feeling death also. It would not be felt if the sexual energy was being released.

Whoever has asked the question must not be making love. Energy is accumulating, coming to such intensity that it is automatic to remember death. Death, if you die consciously, brings you the greatest orgasm you have ever had in your life.

It is meaningful to understand why religions have been against sex, for many reasons. Basically the idea was that if you can remain celibate you can prolong your life as long as you want. That idea is still present.

Mahatma Gandhi in India became celibate -- he was nearabout forty -- because he wanted to live up to the age of a hundred and twenty-five to fight the freedom struggle and to bring it to a conclusion. That was the reason to go into celibacy -- to prolong life.

There is a possibility that if by some scientific means a man's sexual energy is absorbed in his own body, the body will go on renewing, rejuvenating itself for a long time. But ordinarily these so-called celibates are not celibate. The energy is released in some way or other. Even at the age of seventy, Mahatma Gandhi was having nocturnal emissions. And he died with the idea that he had failed in being totally celibate, that's why he was dying before the time he had decided.

The idea has a great potentiality in it. But as far as man is concerned, he cannot do anything directly; it is something that biologists have to do -- to change the sexual energy that accumulates, to revitalize the body rather than being released from the body. Perhaps a scientific celibacy may help man's life to be longer.

But remember, I am talking about scientific celibacy. It has nothing to do with religious celibacy -- that is simply

stupid. You cannot do anything with your biology; you don't know anything about your biology or how it functions.

By the way, woman lives longer than man lives, is healthier than man, is more resistant to disease, does not go mad as easily as man, does not commit suicide so easily. The reason may be that her sexual energy is negative. The positive energy is the active force; the negative energy is the absorbing force.

Perhaps because of this negative, absorbing energy, she has a healthier body, is more resistant to disease, and lives longer. And if biology could manage to get her free from her monthly periods, she could live even longer and healthier. She could really become the stronger sex.

So the idea of sex and death arising together, simply shows that the sexual energy is accumulating -- positive or negative. And negative energy can be accumulated longer. In fact, I have been watching Jaina monks and nuns, who are perhaps the most sincere people in what they are doing.... It may be stupid, but their sincerity is beyond doubt. The nuns seem to take it quite easily, remaining celibate. But the monks get into tremendous difficulty -- the same difficulty as Christian monks or any other monks. Negative energy simply means it is more silent, waiting for the active energy so that it can absorb it. But it has no active force of its own. These are the reasons why I am against things like lesbianism. It is simply stupid -- two negative energies trying to reach to some orgasmic peak. It is simply that either they are pretending, or what they are calling their orgasm is only clitoral, it is not vaginal. And clitoral orgasm is nothing compared to the vaginal orgasm.

Clitoral orgasm is just a kind of foreplay. It can help to bring the vaginal orgasm, but it cannot replace it.
It is really very amazing that such an intimate thing as lovemaking has remained in darkness. I am making the statement -- and this is for the first time in the whole of history that anyone has made this statement -- that clitoral orgasm can be of immense help as foreplay; otherwise the psychologists have been at a loss as to what to make of it, because it has no biological function. To avoid the question, many psychologists even have denied that there is any vaginal orgasm, there is only clitoral orgasm.
Man's orgasm is so quick that he cannot create the vaginal orgasm in that small period of time -- a few seconds. But if clitoral orgasm is created just as foreplay, it is creating a situation for the vaginal orgasm to happen. It has already started: the clitoral orgasm has triggered the process in the body.
But men pay no attention to the clitoral orgasm, because their orgasm can happen easily only with vaginal contact. They are interested only in their own orgasm, and when they are finished they don't think about the woman at all. Lesbianism is spreading in the woman's liberation movement because it is giving them clitoral orgasm; but that is another stupidity because it is simply foreplay. It is as if you had the preface of the book but the book is missing. So you go on reading the preface as long as you want, again and again, but you don't go into the book at all. If the woman is waiting and waiting, she also accumulates a negative energy which she absorbs. If it is too much, then the idea of death can come, because having love in this

state, and having a really beautiful orgasmic feeling, will give her an insight into what happens at death.
There is nothing to fear in it; nothing is destroyed. It is the ultimate peak of your life.
If you have lived your life unconsciously, in misery, in suffering, then before death comes, you are bound to go into a coma. So you don't experience the orgasm, or the awareness that death is not happening to you, to your being, but is happening only to the body, to the vehicle that you have been using up to now.
If the question is from a man, the same is to be understood. But very rarely can a man come to such a peak that he can start thinking of death. His energy is so dynamic, active, that before he comes to such a peak, the energy is released. So my feeling is the question is from a woman.
And nobody has listened to the woman. Nobody has even taken care about what she feels, how she feels. One thing has been understood by man for centuries -- in India we have paintings, statues, depicting the phenomenon -- that man has felt in woman a certain kind of death. That is a misunderstanding. It is not in the woman, it is in your sexual energy itself.
But that's how men always project things; they cannot see that their own sexual energy brings them close to death. And they cannot see very clearly because their sexual energy never comes to such a peak that it reminds them of death. But women, if listened to, have many things of wisdom to say about the phenomenon.
The wise woman has been destroyed by Christianity. They were burned in their thousands in the Middle Ages. The word "witch" simply means a wise woman, but because it

was so condemned, even the word has become condemnatory; otherwise it is a compliment. It is equal to the man of wisdom. All over the world there were wise women, and there were matters into which only a wise woman could give an insight.

These statues in India, and the paintings, are very strange if you don't understand the phenomenon. For example, Shiva is lying down, and his wife, Shivani, is dancing on his chest with a naked sword in one hand, and with a recently-cut head in the other hand; she has a garland of heads, blood is oozing out of all the heads and she is in a mad dance. It seems she will kill Shiva. That dance is so mad, and the woman is in such a mad state, there is no hope for Shiva.

What I have been saying is related to such experiences. In the East, the woman has been listened to. There has never been anything like what happened in the West -- killing and burning women. Women of wisdom have always been listened to, and their wisdom has been absorbed -- because they are half of man. Man's wisdom is half; unless the woman's wisdom is also absorbed, the wisdom cannot become a whole. She has to be asked what the experience is from her side.

The woman, in many orgasmic experiences, particularly in the East, has felt death very close, almost hovering around. I say particularly in the East, because in the East in the ancient days, before repressive ideologies started making people split and schizophrenic, love was not to be made until the urge came to its peak.

It was not that you have to make love every day. Both the partners should wait for each other to come to a state where it is no longer possible to hold on. Naturally, those people

were far more wise. They might have been making love once a week or once a month, but their love yielded tremendous experiences which everyday love cannot yield. You don't have enough energy for that great experience to happen. It needs to be at the peak of your control, throbbing with energy, and then it is really a dance, a merger and meeting of two energies. And at the highest peak, then man may also feel death surrounding him.

One fact has to be remembered -- that nobody in the whole history of man has died making love. That is strange! People have died in all kinds of situations, but nobody has died while he was making love. The feeling of death is there because it is all one energy, but as the sexual energy is released, the feeling of death disperses.

Only lately has medical science accepted one fact, that the people who go on making love do not die of heart attacks. But they should ask: Do they die of anything else? They live longer, and remain younger. But you can make love at the lowest point... that's where people are making it. It is not satisfying, not gratifying; it does not give you any contentment, it simply leaves you in despair.

Love should be made at the highest peak, and that needs a certain discipline. People have used discipline to not make love. I teach discipline to make love rightly, so that your love is not just a biological thing, never reaching your psychological world. And it has the potential to reach even your spiritual world. At the highest peak it will reach your spiritual world.

Why -- at that point -- is one certainly reminded of death? Because you forget your body, you forget your mind; you

remain just a pure consciousness, merged with your partner. It is very, very similar to death.

As you die -- if you are dying consciously -- you will forget the body, you will forget the mind... just consciousness, and then suddenly the consciousness merges into the whole. That merging with the whole is a thousandfold more beautiful than is possible through any orgasm. But both these things are certainly deeply related. They are one. And anyone who wants to understand death, has to understand sex -- or vice versa.

But strange -- people like Sigmund Freud or Carl Gustav Jung, who are trying to understand sex, are so much afraid of death. Their understanding of sex cannot go very far. And as far as death is concerned, nobody thinks about it, nobody even wants to talk about it.

If you start on the subject of death people think you don't know your manners. It is something that has not to be talked about; death has to be simply ignored. But by ignoring death you cannot understand life. They are all connected: sex is the beginning, death is the end. Life is just in between, the energy that flows from sex to death. All three have to be understood together.

The effort has not been made. The experiments have not been made, particularly in the contemporary world. In the East, way back, before Buddha and Mahavira, they must have looked into the phenomenon very closely. Otherwise, what is the need to make Shiva's wife dance on his chest with a garland of skulls and in her hands... one hand is holding a recently-cut head, blood is flowing, and in the other hand is a naked sword? She looks absolutely mad.

This is just a pictorial illustration of the deepest state of orgasm; this is how the woman can be depicted. And the man is just lying under her as she dances. She can cut off his head or he may die just from the dance on his chest. But one thing is certain, that death is there. Whether death happens or not, that is another thing.

Perhaps this is one of the reasons -- unconsciously... because in the West they have always been afraid. They chose only one posture to make love in -- that is, with the man on top, so that he is in control and the woman cannot go absolutely berserk, the way Shivani goes on Shiva's chest.

And the woman has been taught for centuries that she must not even move, because that is not lady-like -- only prostitutes move. She has to lie down almost as if she is dead, unmoving. She will never attain any orgasm, clitoral or vaginal. But she is a lady, and the question of reputation, respectability.... She is not allowed to enjoy, she has to be serious in the whole affair. It is only the man who can make movements, not the woman.

My insight is that this is because of the fear. In the East the common position for love is with the woman on top, not the man. The man being on top is absolutely ugly. He is heavier, he is taller, and he is just crushing a delicate woman unnecessarily. And it will be scientifically right that he is not on the top so that he cannot move much, and the woman has more freedom to move -- to scream with joy, to beat the man, to bite the man, to scratch his face, or whatsoever comes to her.

She has to be a Shivani. She does not have a sword, but she has nails, long nails; she can do much with those nails. And

if she is on top she is faster, the man is slower, and that can bring them together to the orgasmic peak. With the man on top and the woman under him it is impossible to come together to the orgasmic peak. But the man has not cared; he has simply used the woman.

The ancient Eastern wisdom had a totally different attitude. In the time of the Upanishads, the woman was respected the same as the man. There was no question of inequality. She read all the religious scriptures, she was allowed even to go to great discussions.

In one of the great debates called by a king, all the great philosophers and scholars had gathered. He had one thousand cows with gold covering on their horns for the one who was victorious. The debate continued, and about midday Yagnavalkya, one of the most logical minds, came in and told his disciples, "Take the cows to the ashram because they are tired, standing in the hot sun. And as far as the debate goes, I will take care of it."

So confident was he that he was going to win, he took the award before winning! -- those cows were going to be given to the person who was victorious. But he was proved wrong -- and he was proved wrong by a woman. Those must have been beautiful days, when even a woman was allowed to discuss the highest and the most complex questions of life in the court.

The woman did not ask Yagnavalkya many questions. She said, "First I want to ask you: Who created the world?" And Yagnavalkya said, "Everybody knows! Do you think this is a big question? God created the world!"

She laughed -- the name of the woman was Gargi. She said, "You don't have great insight. I said I was going to ask only

two questions and this was the first. Now I want to ask: Who created God? If you answer it, you fall into infinite regress."

That is a logical term meaning that you cannot come to any conclusion. You say, "Another god," and it will be asked again, "Who created him?" You say, "Another god," and the question remains the same; so it is absolutely foolish to bring the first god in -- because it solves nothing; the question remains.

Yagnavalkya became very angry. He was so respected, and the woman had put him in a corner, and the whole meeting of scholars was giggling and laughing. Somebody said, "Send somebody to bring those cows back!"

In his anger, Yagnavalkya said, "Gargi, don't ask such questions; otherwise your head will roll" -- meaning "I will kill you!"

Gargi said, "It would be a great pleasure for me to be killed by the greatest scholar in the country. But I am not going to ask anything else; you simply bring those one thousand cows back."

They had to be brought back, and Gargi took away those one thousand cows.

The king was very happy. He said, "It is perfectly right." And he said to Yagnavalkya, "You should behave. That woman was more cultured than you. Telling her, `Your head will roll' is not the way of a wise man. And the woman did not retort."

If this kind of thing had continued -- continual discussion and understanding between man and woman -- we would have been far more ahead in everything.

It was the worst day when man decided that woman was second-grade and had simply to follow man and his dictates. She is not even allowed to read scriptures, she is not allowed to discuss the great problems of life. And there is no question that she should be asked what the situation is from her side. Her side is half, and this rejection has kept man split, schizophrenic.
It is time that we should bring man and woman wholeheartedly together. Their experiences, their understandings, their meditations, should make one whole -- and that will be the beginning of a real humanity.

Light on the Path

Chapter #25

Chapter title: The master creates a lovesphere
29 January 1986 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
HOW CAN I FIND OUT WHICH OF THE MANY VOICES INSIDE ME IS THE ONE WHICH COMES FROM THE REAL SELF TO GUIDE ME? HOW CAN I BE SURE IT DOESN'T COME FROM THE UNCONSCIOUS?

It is very simple: none of the voices come from the inner self. All voices come from the mind. When all voices are absent, the inner self inspires you in silence towards a certain action, direction. It does not come in words -- it is

just a silent indication. Otherwise it would have been absolutely impossible to find out which one is the voice of the inner self.
It is easy because no voice is of the inner self. So when all voices have died down and there is utter silence, the inner self is capable of taking your hand and moving you. That is the moment to be in a let-go, and allow it to take you wherever it takes you.
In language we have to use words which do not apply to the inner reality -- for example, the "inner voice." There is no voice -- it is simply the inner silence. But if we use the words "inner silence," you will not get the idea that there is some inspiration or some direction which is being pointed to. Hence the words, "inner voice" have been used. But these are not the right words.

Question 2
BELOVED OSHO,
IN EUROPE TODAY THERE IS A DISINTEGRATION OF TRADITIONAL VALUES AND AN IDEOLOGICAL VOID. THE YOUNGER GENERATION IS CALLED THE "NO-FUTURE GENERATION." CAN YOU HELP?

I am certainly helping -- helping the older generation to disappear as quickly as possible, helping the old generation to be finished fast.
And when they call, in an abusive way, the younger generation the "no-future generation," to me it is not a condemnation. It is man coming of age.
To live without future is the greatest courage. Only cowards live in the future.

Man's past has been very cowardly. It was living, not in the present, but in the future: all that has to happen is to happen tomorrow. And in that hope they lived, and they died. And what they were waiting for never turned up. It proved to be waiting for Godot.

The younger generation will have to pass through a very painful experience, because for centuries man has lived either in the past or in the future -- never in the present. The present has remained unexplored, unlived.

And that is the only reality there is.

The younger generation will find it a little difficult to detach itself completely from the old hang-up, and not to be worried that there is no future. On the contrary, rejoice that now there is no future, and we can live in the present. Nobody can live in the future. Future is only a word to keep you going, dragging on. Future does not exist.

So it is a maturity. The disintegration of the past traditions and traditional values is a blessing. They need not be restored. And the younger generation facing a "no future" is a tremendous revolution in consciousness.

Individually we have been talking about meditation as living in the present -- and a few people have lived in the present and reached to the optimum consciousness. But it has happened to only very few individuals. And the greater humanity may have worshipped these people, but it has never believed in them, because it was not their experience -- and they were millions against one man. He may be cheating them. He may be himself illusioned, living in a hallucinatory world.

But because this type of man had certain beautiful qualities which were lacking in the ordinary man, it created a

suspicion in their minds: "Perhaps he is not mad -- perhaps he is right." But there was no other proof except those few attributes of love and compassion, of no anger, of no greed.
If a whole generation faces "no future," it is immensely important, because there is no other way for it to live other than meditatively -- because to live in the present, meditation is the only way.
So first there will be pain and anguish. The old safety is gone, the old security is gone, the old hope is gone; the new generation is being uprooted from the past. But soon it will feel tremendous freedom, a great unburdening; and a realization that the future had never existed -- it was just a mind game.
And we have been befooled by the mind for centuries.
Now the present is there -- whatever you want to make of it you can. And the present is so fleeting. You don't get two points together; just one single point, one single second, and when it has gone, then the second second.... The time is very small. You have to be very intensive and very total to use it. When time is vast, you need not be total, you need not be intensive. You can spread yourself all over time. There is no urgency, there is always future.
But when there is no future, you have only one moment. You cannot afford to waste it in thinking, in planning, in memories, in imagination. You cannot afford it. You have such a small time that you would like to live it. And the smallness gives you intensity and totality.
So the "no future" generation is going to be the beginning of the new humanity I have been talking about.
The new man is not going to have any future -- but the present is more than enough.

Question 3
BELOVED OSHO,
I HAVE DONE SO MANY THERAPY GROUPS IN ORDER TO DEPROGRAM MYSELF; AND ABOVE ALL I HAVE THE GREATEST FORTUNE IN EXISTENCE TO BE SO CLOSE TO YOU. STILL, SOMETIMES I FEEL LIKE HAVING MOVED MILES FROM WHERE I WAS STUCK A FEW YEARS AGO, AND SOMETIMES I FEEL I HAVEN'T MOVED ONE INCH. THEN I FEEL SO DESPERATE THAT EVERYTHING SEEMS TO BE FUTILE. I CAN WATCH THIS HAPPENING BUT STILL THERE IS SUFFERING. PLEASE GIVE YOUR ADVICE.

It happens to everybody, because both the experiences are still of the mind. The beautiful space and the despair, the suffering -- they are not opposite to each other. They are part of the same mind, because mind exists in duality.
It is just like a bullock cart: two wheels are needed. You cannot have a bullock cart with one wheel. The mind is even older than a bullock cart -- it is the mind that invented the bullock cart.
The trouble arises when you start identifying yourself with the beautiful moments, then you are getting ready for trouble. Then soon the other thing is going to happen: you will be suffering, you will be desperate.
So the first thing to be understood is that both things are of the mind. That will give you a little distance from both the experiences. And secondly, don't bother about the suffering and the despair. Concentrate when you are feeling

beautiful, when you are feeling that you have moved miles from where you were stuck. That is the moment to remember, "It is a mind game, and I am not going to participate. I am going to remain simply a witness."

Not identifying with the beautiful moment will automatically destroy the other part: the suffering, the despair.

People always do vice-versa; and that is not possible in the nature of things, because the second part is the other side of the coin. When you are feeling beautiful, you get identified; you feel, "It is me, this is my real self."

Now you are preparing the ground -- digging the ditch to fall into it. And when you are in despair and suffering, then how can you say, "I will be simply a witness"? You cannot be a witness.

Nobody wants despair or pain, all those negative feelings; everybody wants to get rid of them. But the way to get rid of them is to get rid of them through the beautiful spaces that you come across.

So whenever you are again feeling in a silent, peaceful, blissful state, remind yourself -- don't fall asleep -- remind yourself, "This is not me. I am just seeing something far away there on the screen. I am just consciousness, awareness. I am taking note of it, what is happening there."

Keep aloof. It will be a little difficult -- one wants to jump into it, it is so beautiful -- but if you can keep aloof from the beautiful moments, you have won a great victory, because the person who is capable of keeping himself just a witness of beautiful moments and does not get identified.... It will be child's play for him to witness depression when it comes.

Both the extremes, witnessed, start disappearing.
Witnessing is almost the finest fire you can find. Witness anything and that thing soon disappears. And don't be afraid that beautiful spaces will disappear. You don't know yet what is really waiting ahead of you -- when beautiful spaces and depressive moments both have gone, when that duality is no longer there.
You are not aware of what is going to happen to you. It is so profound and so deep that those who have found it have remained silent. They will not say a single word about it. There is no word in any language to express it. All these words -- "beautiful," "blissful" -- fall too short. And the greatest thing is that there is no duality, that you have come to a point which remains with you always; there is no opposite to it.
This is something to be remembered, that whenever you experience something of which there is no opposite, you have come home. While the opposite exists you will be torn apart continuously.
Between those two experiences you will be just a football -- sometimes feeling happy, sometimes feeling miserable; but never knowing yourself, that there is something beyond both the beautiful and the depressive. That's why it cannot be brought into words, because all words are dualistic; otherwise they won't have any meaning.
This is the nature of language: you cannot have a word without having its opposite. If you don't have the opposite, then the word won't have any meaning.
If somebody asks you, "What is light?," you can say, "That which is not darkness." How do you define light? -- by its opposite; otherwise you don't have any definition. How do

you define health? -- just by saying that it is opposite to sickness. How do you define life? -- by saying it is opposite to death. Without the opposite you cannot even have meaning for any word.
So just try to reach into a wordless space.
Begin from the beautiful space, because in those moments you are more full of energy, and it is possible to get out of it. When you are depressed, all your energy is so dull, so sad, that you cannot get out of it.
So use those beautiful moments just for a jumping board into the wordless, non-dual experience of your own being. Once you have succeeded in doing it from the beautiful space, you will be able to succeed in the depressive part also, because now you know the way, now you understand that those were not anything significant. You were simply getting identified with fictions.
Now you have touched reality -- and reality is strength, power. And then slowly the other spaces will disappear and you will remain in this wordless experience without falling out of it.
You can call it true meditation, the authentic experience of life. It only looks difficult if you have not tried. Once you have tried, it is a very simple experience.

Question 4
BELOVED OSHO,
THE FEELING OF BEING EVEN A LITTLE BIT OPEN IS SO FANTASTIC THAT IT FEELS IRRELEVANT WHETHER THERE IS ANYTHING TO BE OPEN FOR OR NOT.

I KNOW THIS IS NOT A QUESTION, BUT I JUST WANTED TO SAY IT.

It is a question, and a meaningful question too.
Opening to something is really a device. There is nothing to open for: the real thing is opening.
But people are such that if you say, "Just open," they will think it crazy. They want to open for something. Their minds always function through motivation. They want to love someone. You simply say to them, "Love," and it will be very difficult for them. It is absolutely certain they will ask, "Who?" That has happened with meditation for centuries.
Even the word "meditation" is not right, because in the English language there is no word which can really describe the Sanskrit word dhyana or the Japanese word zen. Japanese had no word, Chinese also had no word; the Sanskrit word dhyana became zana because Buddha was not speaking Sanskrit, he was speaking Pali. In Pali the word becomes zana, and from Pali, in China, it became ch'an. And in Japan, ch'an became zen. But it is the same word -- dhyan.
In English it never happened. There are three words: concentration, contemplation, meditation -- but none of the three is relevant because concentration immediately reminds you: "On what?" Contemplation immediately reminds you: "On what?" And meditation also reminds you: "On what?" You tell somebody to meditate, and the immediate question will be, "On what?" Just to meditate seems to be madness. How can you meditate without an object? How can you love without an object?

And the same is the situation about opening up. So devices which are false have been used: "Open to the master," "Open to existence," "Open to God" -- but open to something. That makes sense to the mind. Just to say to the mind, "Open!" makes no sense. Why should I open myself? For what? Mind is essentially a motivated mechanism.

So what you are saying -- that just opening a little bit is so beautiful that it seems irrelevant for what you are opening.... It is irrelevant. There is nobody, there is nothing for which you are told to open. It is just to manipulate your mind, to speak in a language that it can understand, knowing perfectly well that when it opens it will understand why a false device was used.

All devices are false.

The real question is your opening.

The more you are closed, the more you are in darkness; the more you are closed, the more you are dead. The dead person is completely closed.

In all countries, in all traditions, when a person dies... if his eyes are open, they immediately close them, for the simple reason that it doesn't suit a dead man to have open eyes: "You please keep them shut!" Now everything is closed.

I was concerned about it from my childhood when I saw that dead people's eyes are immediately closed. I used to ask my father, my grandfather, "What harm are they doing? Let them see the world a little more. What is this taboo that you immediately close their eyes?"

They had no answer, they simply said, "This is the convention -- it has always been done."

Only later on with my own experience of opening did I understand something: that opening is life; to be fully open

is enlightenment. Closing is death -- to be completely closed. And then I remembered why people close the eyes, because that is the only part that remains open; everything is already closed. The man is dead -- it is better to close his eyes.

Life is in opening -- becoming broader and broader, becoming vaster and vaster -- to a point where nothing in you remains unopened. It has nothing to do with anything else -- why you are opening, for what you are opening. These are all nonsense. But tell people to do anything, and they will immediately ask, "For what?"

So there is no harm in giving them a false device if the false device can help.

Their opening will make them aware that the device was false, but they will be grateful to you that, for their sake, you even lied. And all masters have lied on many significant points. They had to lie; otherwise they could not help anybody. But the lie was just so that your mind could understand there was something to gain; and to gain it, it can allow your being to be open.

You are right: even just a little bit of opening is a great experience, and it does not matter at all that there is nothing to open to.

In the same way, the lie of God was created, the lie of paradise was created, the lie of heaven and hell was created, because your mind will not function, will not listen. The simple truth will not be challenging enough for it: just to open for nothing?

So that is the truth: opening for nothing... because the joy is in the opening, not in anything else; the ecstasy is in the opening, not in any object for which you are opening.

Question 5
BELOVED OSHO,
IT OCCURS TO ME THAT THE BEAUTY OF HAVING A MASTER IS NOT SO MUCH THAT YOU FIND IN HIM SOMEONE WHO REALLY LOVES YOU, BUT THAT YOU HAVE FOUND SOMEONE WHO WILL LET YOU REALLY LOVE THEM.
DO YOU HAVE ANYTHING TO SAY ABOUT THIS?

It is true in a way, and it is not true in another way.
The question has two parts. First, the real beauty of being with a master is not that he loves you. And the second: the real beauty is that he allows you to love him.
The second is certainly significant. That's the function of the master, to create an atmosphere -- or to be exactly right, a lovesphere -- in which you can love, where love becomes almost like breathing, where love is not a problem, where love is not a business, where love is not a law... where love is just playfulness, with no guilt, with no motivation, with no end to be gained beyond it: Love for love's sake.
That is really the function of the master: to create a lovesphere. And I call those masters fake, who have done just the opposite: they have created a hatesphere instead of a lovesphere. This can be a criterion to judge whether there is a real master or not: what kind of sphere is created around him?
But to create this sphere the first part is absolutely necessary.
You cannot say it is not important that a master loves you. It is absolutely important that a master loves you; otherwise

he cannot create the lovesphere. It is created only by loving. If the master himself is not loving you, he cannot be capable of creating a sphere around him.
The same thing has to be remembered: when I say, "The master loves you," I am talking to your mind mechanism. The truth is, the master is love. To say that he loves you is not the right thing -- he is love.
So whoever is with him is showered with his love. If he is open, he will get more of it; if he is closed, he will not get any of it -- because the love of the master is not addressed to somebody in particular. It is unaddressed: to whomsoever it may belong. Whoever is open will get it.
So the first part is also very essential; otherwise the second part will not be possible. The master is love, and in being love, he creates a certain sphere around himself. Those who come under his sphere, they will be loving. Slowly, slowly their love will also become unaddressed.
That is the perfection of love.
First they will love each other, their love will be towards a certain person. The work of the master is not to let them become attached to individuals, because he is not teaching them love for particular individuals, he is teaching the quality of love, the energy of love. The particular persons they love are just experiments for growing, maturing. Slowly, slowly they will come to a point where they are just love -- not addressed, but available.
Just as in the other question about opening -- that just a little bit of opening is so ecstatic that it does not matter for whom you are opening -- the same is true about all spiritual qualities. Love... it does not matter for whom, it does not matter at all whether there is anybody, but your heart is

radiating with love. That will give you the greatest experience of love.

And they are all joined; all spiritual qualities are joined. The opening without any object, the love without any object, are exactly the same; they are not different. As the opening will grow, the love will grow -- or vice versa. All spiritual qualities grow together in the same proportion.

It is not that one quality -- truth -- grows ahead, and then comes love and then comes compassion. No -- in fact they are not different things, just different expressions of one, ecstatic experience. You can call that ecstatic experience any name. "Opening" is perfectly good; so is "love" -- and all other qualities will be there.

It is not that first you have to practice this and then you have to practice that. If you can simply manage being loving and not being attached... it is attachment that kills love, because it is attachment that destroys freedom, and love cannot exist in a state of bondage.

Love can exist only in total freedom.

Freedom is also part of the spiritual qualities; you cannot separate them. But in the beginning one has to start from very raw material, so that if one is alert one can sort out what is wrong. If people are not alert, they start doing very stupid things.

Seeing that love brings a certain kind of bondage, rather than destroying the bondage and its causes, they start becoming afraid of love. After a few experiences of getting into love and getting caught in bondage, they become certain that love is going to create chains for them, an imprisonment; it is better to live without love.

They harden their hearts. But they have misunderstood the whole thing. It was not love that was creating the bondage; it was attachment, it was jealousy.

If you can love without jealousy, if you can love without attachment, if you can love a person so much that his happiness is your happiness.... Even if he is with some other woman and he is happy, it makes you happy because you love him so much: his happiness is your happiness. You will be happy because he is happy, and you will be grateful to the woman who made the person you love, happy -- you will not be jealous. Then love has come to a purity.

This love cannot create any bondage. And this love is simply the opening of the heart to all the winds, to the whole sky. It looks a little strange; but we have been taught continually that love is a relationship, so we have become accustomed to the idea that love is a relationship. But that is not true. That is the lowest kind -- very polluted.

Love is a state of being. So a master can sit silently in his room; nobody is there. That does not mean that he is no longer loving because there is nobody whom he can love. Love is his heartbeat.

Love is his song.

Love is his silence.

Love is his radiation -- whether there is anybody to receive it or not does not matter.

So your question is good; the second part is perfectly right -- but you are not aware that without the first, the second will not be possible. The master has to be pure love; then only can he create a vibe around himself to purify you, to

raise the level of your love, and to make love your only religion.

Light on the Path

Chapter #26

Chapter title: The moment you find the truth, everything stops

30 January 1986 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1

BELOVED OSHO,

I HAVE HEARD YOU SAY THAT SEEKING THE TRUTH IS AS ECSTATIC AS FINDING IT. DOES THAT NOT ELIMINATE THE SEARCH?

It does not eliminate the search. On the contrary, it enhances the search because it makes seeking as important as finding.

It is a very fundamental question. Finding the truth is naturally thought to be ecstatic, even intellectually. But no one has paid attention to the search, the seeking. I am saying that seeking the truth is even far more ecstatic. All the failures, all the small successes, little glimpses, small open spaces, the few moments of ecstasy coming and coming....

Seeking is a very courageous phenomenon; it is growth. Finding is, really, fulfillment of seeking. The finding is the last point in your search, the fulfillment. Fulfillment has ecstasy, but it is now going to be permanent; it is going to

be eternal. Soon you will become accustomed to it, it will be just natural.

And then only you will be able to understand those few moments, far and wide, on the way, when you had seen just a little glimpse. It was very fleeting, but it was tremendous excitement. That excitement has brought you farther and farther... closer to the truth.

Attaining to the truth, the first moment of fulfillment is of enormous blissfulness; but soon it becomes a natural phenomenon. It is with you twenty-four hours a day -- and it is with you forever.

Only the person who has found the truth can say that seeking is far more important. It is not eliminating the search; it is making the search more beautiful, more challenging, more juicy than the truth itself -- as if truth is just an excuse and the search is the real thing.

I am saying "as if"; it is not so. Truth is the real thing. The search is just a means, the truth is the end. But the means are not less important than the end. They should be given more importance than the end, because without the means you cannot find the end.

And on the way there are many spaces of great rejoicing. And because you are still moving between misery and joy, between despair and contentment... because of the contrast you can experience the contentment more clearly.

It is as if something is written on a blackboard with white chalk. But when you have arrived it is something written on a white board with white chalk: there is no contrast.

I made that statement in order to make it clear... there may be persons who have the courage to go without the master. It is arduous -- still they have to be encouraged. It is going

to be difficult. It is going to be a long, long journey. Their journey has to be made as lovely as possible.

If it is simply a misery for many lives and nothing else -- just hard work, and no glimpses and no joy -- then it will be inhuman to ask anybody to go on that journey. Then it will be better to suggest he follow a guide who has the map, who knows the right routes; who knows on each crossroad where to move, where not to move, which road leads to the goal, and which roads there are that lead nowhere.

But I had not made the statement just to encourage them. That was just one part of it -- it is true also. The journey is long, perhaps very long, but there are many places, many stops on the path where you will find great blissfulness. When the journey ends, you have come home: everything settles, the contrast disappears. Now there is no misery, no anger, no anguish; slowly, slowly you start forgetting even the taste of those things.

I have forgotten completely how anguish tastes, how anxiety tastes. I can describe it, but my description is not very authoritative. It is a memory which is fading every day.

There is a beautiful story I must have told you. It is one of the poems of Rabindranath Tagore. The poet himself has been seeking God for centuries. Sometimes he finds him just as close as the horizon, and he rejoices that the home is coming closer... just a little more traveling and he will reach the ultimate, beyond which nothing exists.

But it goes on happening: he goes on moving, and the truth goes on moving. Sometimes, near a faraway star, he sees God. Although it is far away, because he can see him, he dances in ecstasy: "If I can see you, it is sure I am going to

find you. How long can you go on playing this game of hide and seek? You try your best, hiding; I am trying my best, seeking -- and I am determined to find you!"

And after many, many lives of search and these beautiful moments... and also moments of anguish, anxiety, because for years there are no signs of God, no footprints -- he does not know where he has disappeared to. He even starts suspecting whether he had really seen him or imagined him. Was it an illusion, a projection, a dream? Was he awake or asleep? But again those moments come and he is on the path, moving with great courage and great trust, knowing that these moments are indubitably true.

And this goes on happening. Finally one day he reaches a house where, written on a name plate is: Here lives God. He is overjoyed -- he dances, he sings -- that he has reached God's home. Now where can he hide?

Then he goes up the steps and is just going to knock on the door, and something within him prevents him.

Something within him says, "Wait a minute! Think twice before you knock. If you find God then what are you going to do next? -- because there is nothing left. This search has been your life for many, many lives -- that was all your adventure, that was all your misery and your ecstasy. But if you find him -- then give a little thought: What are you going to do?"

A great fear grips him. He takes his shoes off so that no noise is made on the steps. Who knows? -- hearing the noise on the steps, God himself may open the door! And he runs away with his shoes, as fast as he can, as far away as he can.

And then he starts searching for God again -- with the same joy, with the same agony, with the same ecstasy. And now he knows the house of God; so he avoids the house of God and searches for him everywhere else, where he is not! Because the search is so beautiful, he sacrifices finding for the search.

It is a very strange poem -- nothing like this has ever been written in the whole history of literature -- but greatly significant. He knows perfectly where God is. He can go directly and knock on the door, but he is not going to do that -- he avoids him.

First it was God who was hiding, and he was seeking. He still pretends to seek, but the reality is that he is hiding and God is seeking. Because in strange places... he comes around his home, and then he has to escape from there. It has great insight.

The seeking is not eliminated by my statement. It is enhanced; so much so that the sought becomes secondary, and the seeking becomes primary, more significant.

And I made that statement so that if somebody wants to choose to move alone, I should be of some help to him -- even though he is going to move alone, even though he does not want to have a master. But the master's compassion cannot see him moving on a path which is going to be dangerous and long. The master cannot do anything else on the path, but he can at least give him an insight, that finding is not such a great thing as seeking is. And unless this enters into the heart of the seeker who is going to be alone, he cannot remain alone. I am not saying

he should remain alone -- he can choose a master. I am simply making it clear that both are possible.

There have been both types of people. There are old, traditional people, who all insist that without the master you cannot find -- categorically, without any exception. And there is J. Krishnamurti, against the whole tradition, saying that you cannot find if you have a master -- again, categorically, without any exception -- you can find only alone.

I am saying something against both, that they are making absolute statements which are not true. There are always exceptions; and particularly in the world of spirituality where freedom is the law, you cannot enforce such categorical statements -- both are taking away that freedom. The tradition is preventing you from moving alone; J. Krishnamurti is preventing you from moving with a master. My own experience is that ninety-nine percent of the people will move with a master. Perhaps one percent will be able to move alone. But both are valid ways, and I don't see any contradiction.

Even people like Jesus had a master. He was initiated by John the Baptist. He was a disciple, and he became a master only because John the Baptist was imprisoned and finally beheaded. And Christianity has made so much fuss about Christ's crucifixion that nobody thinks of his master, who was tortured more. For years in jail he was tortured, and then he was beheaded.

Jesus' crucifixion has been magnified so much that everybody has forgotten John the Baptist. And he was a man of immense insight. Even from jail, when he heard about statements and actions of Jesus, he doubted Jesus'

enlightenment. And he sent a messenger -- a guard who had fallen in love with the old master -- to Jesus saying, "Are you really the messiah for whom the Jews have been waiting?"

Now this question from the master creates great suspicions. It is equivalent to asking him, "Are you enlightened?" This is a Jewish way of asking the same thing. And when a man like John the Baptist asks such a question, it is not of small significance.

He was not a traditionalist, he was not orthodox; he was more revolutionary than Jesus. His words were just pure fire. It was his words and his revolutionary statements that had drawn Jesus and thousands of other people to be initiated by him.

Jesus had a master -- and still missed.

Gautam Buddha had not only one master but many masters. One master he exhausted of all that he knew. He practiced, and practiced so perfectly that the master said, "Now I have nothing else to teach to you. You should move to some more developed spiritual being. I can help you only so far."

"But," Buddha said, "the goal has not arrived."

The master said, "It has not arrived for me either -- I am on the path. So whatsoever I knew, whatsoever path I had traveled, I showed to you. And you have been so quick and so perfect that you have caught up with me. Others are not quick, others are lazy. They still think that I am the perfect master because I am still ahead of them. But to you I cannot be untrue. You move on -- there are people who have gone far ahead of me."

And Buddha continued to move for six years, from one master to another master. And whatever they said, he did it

-- did it with his totality and intensity. But the goal was as far away as ever. And finally each master had to make an apology to him: "I should have told you before that I have not reached yet -- I am on the way. I can teach you only up to the point where I have reached."

After moving from one master to another.... The last master was Allah Khallum, who was perhaps the best of all that he had been with. He remained for two years with him, but then the same thing happened.

Allah Khallum said, "This is where you have to depart from me. And I would suggest that now you start the search alone, because I don't see anybody who can take you further than I have taken you. So drop this whole idea of a master and being a disciple -- and you can destroy any master because you are such a perfect disciple.

"The masters are living and enjoying great dignity and power because of the idiots. They don't do anything; they just hang around. But you are so intent to reach that even we start feeling that here is a man who should not be deceived.

"And anyway we cannot deceive you. All that we know, we have given to you. We don't know whether it leads to truth or not, because how can we know? -- we are also in the middle of the way. Whether it leads to somewhere or not can be known only when we have reached to the end. And I know almost all the masters around. It is better you start moving alone -- on your own."

Perhaps Buddha is the first person who reached to the goal without a master. But one cannot say that those masters did not help him. They did not help him to the end -- they may have helped him only in small ways -- but they certainly

helped him to eliminate many things. They certainly made it clear to him that it is better to go alone, to take the risk. Perhaps that is the greatest revolution -- which has not been taken note of -- that Buddha reached alone, without a master, that his enlightenment was not recognized by any master. It was his self-revelation -- there was nobody to recognize him.

Krishnamurti has a similarity to Buddha, but also many dissimilarities. He had many masters but they were not chosen by him, they were forced upon him. He was just a puppet in the hands of the Theosophists, so whatsoever they wanted to do with him, they did. And when they were going to declare him a world teacher -- he is certainly an honest man -- he refused... just because of his honesty. Otherwise he was going to be the richest religious leader in the world, having the greatest following. And he was going to found a new religion. But the man is absolutely honest; he simply refused -- he could not be anybody's master. Since then he has been teaching against the masters, because those masters were forced upon him. Gautam Buddha has not said a single word against his masters. In fact he has praised Allah Khallum, that he was a man of great insight, understanding, and that he helped him to go alone, and he was grateful for that.

But Krishnamurti simply condemned all his masters because they were forced on him, and he must have been accumulating resentment. And in this whole affair of Krishnamurti rejecting the world teacher's role -- condemning all the masters, condemning the whole idea that a master is a necessity -- he went to the other extreme, saying that a master is a hindrance.

In this whole affair one completely forgets whether Krishnamurti is enlightened or not. Masters are wrong -- certainly he can say that, but only about the masters he had. None of them was enlightened; none of them ever claimed to be enlightened.

His declaration that he is not going to be the world teacher shows only half the truth. It is sincere that he refused, but the question is: why is he refusing? Is he not capable of being a world teacher -- is he not yet enlightened? -- or is the very existence of teachers and masters wrong? He has taken the second idea.

My feeling is different. I can see his honesty in refusing to be the world teacher, but I also see that he is not stating the whole truth. He should also have said, "I am not yet enlightened -- how can I be a world teacher?" That half-truth nobody has asked him about -- and he has never answered it. He turned the whole thing against the very idea of masters, that it is wrong, and that's why he is refusing to be a master.

So without making a clear-cut statement that "I am enlightened," it gives you just an indirect idea that the man must be enlightened -- he is so honest that he rejects the world teachership, and all the glory, all the money, all the land and the castles that were coming with it. But just to be honest does not mean you are enlightened. Honesty is a good quality; it can be in an enlightened person. It will help him to become enlightened, but it is not equivalent to it.

Since then Krishnamurti has been hammering against masters. And he knows only his own masters; he has not known any enlightened master.

That gives me the clear-cut idea that he has been traveling alone but is still traveling. And because he is so full of complaints against other people, his traveling has become not a pilgrimage of joy, it has become a migraine. For forty years he has suffered from migraine. That migraine seems to me to be certainly connected with his strange situation. He is not enlightened; thousands of people think he is enlightened. He has never said it, but they have accepted it because he rejected the world teachership. That is not any proof of enlightenment, but it can be the proof of honesty and unenlightenment.

He could see that he was not capable of being a world teacher: he himself is in darkness, and he is not going to deceive the world. He has to be praised for it.

But then a mystery has been surrounding him. And for these so many years -- now he is ninety -- he has not said, on even a single occasion, anything about his enlightenment or unenlightenment. And he has been speaking all this time. It is very strange!

And all the speeches are about enlightenment! But he never brings himself into it. He talks about enlightenment as an objective -- but never as a subjective -- experience.

So there are only these two instances: Buddha, who had masters of his own choice, never said a single word against them. He was simply all praise that they were all honest -- whatever they could do, they did. And then finally he went alone and found the truth.

The second instance is J. Krishnamurti, who condemned his own teachers. They were really worth condemning; they deserved it. He refused the world teachership, showed some integrity of personality, some sincerity and honesty -- but

he has never said anything about his own enlightenment, this way or that.

And his whole life he has never looked ecstatic, joyous; even smiling is difficult for him. You can see him being angry against traditions, against teachers; you can see him being angry against the audience, pulling his hair because they do not understand what he is saying.

Now, there is no need to be angry: it is their choice to understand or not to understand; it is your choice to speak or not to speak. If people don't understand you, don't speak! And if you speak and they don't understand, it has nothing to do with you. You enjoyed speaking; they enjoyed listening. Whether they understand it or not is their problem. Why should you get into such a rage? -- as if something very valuable is at stake and they should understand you!

But this is the attitude of the masters, the very stern and hard masters. Krishnamurti had denied being a world teacher, but he has been doing the same job of teaching the whole world -- and being harsh and hard with innocent people who want to understand something about life. And what can they do if they cannot understand you? Perhaps the fault is yours. Perhaps the way you present your ideology is not the right way. Perhaps you make it too complicated and too intellectual. And people are not so complicated and so intellectual.

Most people have attained through the masters. Buddha attained alone, and that is a milestone. Krishnamurti has tried... but is still traveling, and traveling in anguish, not in joy. That means the search for the truth has become a

hardship for him. Perhaps it has become just intellectual gymnastics.

I have never been to any master in any of my lives as a disciple. I have met a few masters, but I have always made it clear to them that I am not the disciple type: "If you can allow me to be with you, to have a friendship with you, I will be happy. But if you reject me, that too is perfectly acceptable, because that is your choice. But I have to make it clear from the very beginning that I am not anybody's disciple."

The journey has been very long but has been tremendously rewarding. I would have loved it to be still longer, because the moment you find the truth, everything stops. Time stops, movement stops; you start living in an eternal moment.

It is peaceful, silent, very still; but you cannot call it ecstasy -- the way it was possible to call it on the way -- because ecstasy can exist only by the side of agony.

It is not any of those things that can exist only with their opposite. It is utterly quiet. It has tremendous beauty, it is fulfillment -- nothing can be added to it -- but knowing this state and remembering the moments of ecstasy while seeking, I would have preferred the journey to have been a little longer.

Once you have attained to the truth, then only can you see what was the beauty of the seeking, the search. But now there is no way to go back.

It is easy in Rabindranath Tagore's poem to take your shoes off and run away. But it is not possible -- that part is possible only in poems and stories. In reality it is not possible: you cannot get away from the truth. Once you

have got it, you have got it; now there is no way to lose it, no way to again create a game of hide and seek.
So I have made the statement simply to make it clear that you can choose to be alone on the path -- it has its own beauty. You can choose to be with a master -- it has its own efficiency. But ninety-nine percent of the people have attained through masters.
Perhaps once in a while somebody has stumbled alone into the temple of truth. That too seems to be very accidental, because without a guide and without a map.... And this vast existence... searching for something when you do not know exactly what it is, where it is, whether it is or not, and running in all directions madly. It has its hardships; it has its beautiful oases in the desert.
All I want is that everyone should be a seeker; whether he is with a master or alone is a secondary thing. If one chooses to be alone one should not choose it out of any egoistic reasons; otherwise one's journey will be simply a journey of agony, self-torture. And one will not have any moments of ecstasy, any glimpses -- and there is no way that one will ever reach, even by accident.
He should be clear, if he is going alone he is not going because of his ego: he is going alone because he wants to be alone, and he loves to be alone; he enjoys to be alone, to him that aloneness is simply a joy.
For the ego, aloneness is never a joy.
That's why I am making those conditions. Ego enjoys only when it subordinates somebody, when it can say, "I am higher than you, bigger than you."
Ego can never enjoy aloneness; in aloneness what is the point of having an ego? And it is the ego which can prevent

somebody being a disciple, because that means you are putting somebody above you; you are surrendering yourself.

So ego can choose to be alone, but then it is choosing a self-torture, a hell. And that is what I have seen in people who have become interested in J. Krishnamurti's philosophy. They are all egoistic intellectuals. The reason they have chosen J. Krishnamurti's philosophy is that he allows them not to submit to any master -- but they are not happy.

I have known many of his disciples, old disciples. One woman used to come to me, she must have been eighty. She has been listening to him from the very beginning, and I asked her, "Listening to Krishnamurti for so many years, what is the need to come to me? I am a master."

And what she said is applicable to many others, because with many others the same thing happened. She said, "Yes, I have been listening to him, and I have been thinking to find the truth alone. But how to find it alone? Where to go? What to do? It becomes just an intellectual game."

So I said, "Then it will be difficult for you, because if I say to you to become a sannyasin, to be a disciple, then you will bring all that gibberish that you have learned: that no master is needed, that one can find the truth alone. So first you be clear; I don't take any nonsense. If you come to me, then leave Krishnamurti behind; otherwise I have no problem -- you follow Krishnamurti, you listen to him. And you have listened long -- you are eighty years old -- it is only a question of a few years more."

And the same has been the case with many intellectuals in India. They became interested in Krishnamurti for the

simple reason that he gives a shelter to their ego. But that is the problem: with the ego you cannot go in search of truth; then you will be sad.

So nobody in these sixty, sixty-five years of Krishnamurti's teaching has been able to become enlightened. And the strangest thing is that if it is true that no master is needed -- if it is absolutely true that a master is a hindrance -- then Krishnamurti should not have spoken at all. Because that is playing with people's lives. You go on saying to them that no master is needed; and in their unconscious you become their master.

So it is a strange game.

You go on saying, "No master is needed," and they repeat like a parrot, "No master is needed," but their repetition that "no master is needed" is not their own understanding, is not their own finding. It has been given by somebody else: they have followed a master.

All Krishnamurti people are repeating simply verbatim what Krishnamurti says. They have not been able to add even a single word to it. It is very surprising.

I have seen disciples of masters, but I have not seen in those disciples such puppet-like repetition -- just gramophone records. Even though they are with a master they have a certain independence. If the master is true, they have full independence.

But with Krishnamurti there is no master, and all the people who have been listening to him are simply repeating, word for word, giving every argument that Krishnamurti has given.

I have asked these people, "Have you found any argument on your own? Have you looked into what you are saying,

that it is not yours? Then you have a master and a very dangerous one, because he gives you the idea that you are independent -- so you enjoy your ego -- and still you go on repeating his words."
And all borrowed knowledge fits with the ego very easily. One's own experience does not fit with the ego; they cannot coexist.
My position is very realistic: Most of the people have attained with masters, and there is nothing wrong in it. A few people have attained without a master -- there is nothing wrong in it. The whole question is to attain; which route you choose -- shorter or longer -- depends on you. But I am not eliminating the search, I am making it available to all kinds of people. I am not making it a monopoly -- either this or that.
I don't believe in either/or.
I say both are valid.

Question 2
BELOVED OSHO,
IS JEALOUSY YET ANOTHER FORM OF COWARDICE?

Jealousy is very complicated. It has many ingredients in it. Cowardice also is one of them; egoistic attitudes is another; monopolistic desire -- not an experience of love but only of possessiveness; a tendency to be competitive; a deep-rooted fear of being inferior....
So many things are involved in jealousy.
You love a person -- at least you think you love a person.... If you really love, then jealousy is impossible. If you find

the person loving somebody else, you will be happy: you love the person, and he is happy with somebody else; and all that you want is to make him happy. You will not feel jealous; on the contrary you will feel grateful to the person who has made your lover happy. You will feel a great friendliness.

But this is about true love, which is a rare variety. What exists in the name of love is just an idea.

You "love" a person means you possess a person. You "love" a person means he cannot love anybody else. If he loves anybody else he is insulting you; he is proving that you are inferior, that there are better people, more lovable people than you are. It hurts the ego, it hurts your possessiveness, it hurts your monopolistic idea.

And basically it is cowardice, because you are not trying to face the facts about your love in a straightforward manner. It is not a question of your lover loving somebody else; the question is, do you love the person? And you are not brave enough to face that question. And that is the real question to be asked.

If I love the person then nothing matters.

Love allows freedom.

Love allows that whatever he feels like doing, he can do. Whatever he feels to be blissful, it is his choice.

If you love the person, then you don't interfere in his privacy. You leave that person's privacy uninterfered with. You don't try to trespass his inner being. You don't want that he should say where he has been, why he is late in the night. That is not right at all.

It is his life: where he goes, and whether he comes late or not.... You have loved the person as he is -- and this is the

way he is. And you never try to interfere in his privacy. You don't open his letters; you don't look into his pockets, into his diary and note the phone numbers. You don't try to find out some clue. That is all ugly.

You have to face it yourself.

If you don't face it, that is cowardice.

And to hide it, you make so much of a tantrum of jealousy that you completely forget that it is only your cowardice. What was needed was to be very clear whether it is an idea that you love the man, or it is a reality. Reality has no problems; only ideas bring trouble because they are just superficial. Underneath there is so much rubbish that those ideas cannot help you. Any small thing and immediately trouble starts.

I cannot conceive that if two persons really love each other they will ever have any fight for any reason, that they will try to impose any idea on the other for any reason, that they will try to inhibit the other person from any action.

Love's basic requirement is: "I accept the other person as he is." And love never tries to change the person according to one's own idea of them. You do not try to cut the person here and there and bring him to size -- which is being done everywhere all over the world.

People who think they are lovers -- they are continually harassing each other, trying to create the image that they want. They want the other person just as a puppet -- and the strings should be in their hands. And the same is being done by the other person: he wants you to be a puppet, and the strings have to be in his hands. Now there is going to be continual conflict, misery, pain.

And one starts feeling a great wonder: why have poets been writing so many beautiful things about love? -- because nothing seems to happen! It is only in the poetries.

The reality is that most of the poets have never loved. They are in love with the idea of love, so they make beautiful poems, beautiful novels. Or perhaps they have loved, but failed so utterly that just to console themselves they create the polar opposite in their poetry.

For example, Leo Tolstoy was tortured by his wife for his whole life, even to the very end. The last day, she harassed him so much that he left the house at night and went to the station and died there on a bench. He was a count, and he had immense property and immense land and everything -- but he lived like a poor man. The wife had control of everything.

She would not allow him even to have a friend, a male friend. She was so jealous that she would not allow him to read or write in front of her. He had to go out in the garden or in the fields to write; all his writing was done outside. Her jealousy was such that..., "When I am present you are more interested in your novel. This is an insult to me!"

And this man has written such beautiful books and such beautiful things about love, that if you didn't know his life, you could not believe how it is possible. It is a compensation. In life he is missing it; he is putting it in the novels: in the novels he is creating the fantasy he would have liked his life to be, just to forget his life, its ugliness.

So either the poets have never loved and known, have never known the agony of it; or, if they have loved, they have known the agony of it and they wanted to know the ecstasy. So in their poetry you will find the ecstasy of love.

But the truth is that the whole world is tortured unnecessarily.

Yes, it is cowardice that keeps you in torture. Just face the facts, whether you love a man or not. If you love, then there are no conditions to be put. If you don't love, then who are you to put conditions?

Either way it is clear. If you love then there is no question of conditions: you love him as he is. If you don't love, then too there is no problem: he is nobody to you; there is no question of putting conditions. He can do whatsoever he wants to do.

But one has to face one's feelings in a very sincere and honest way. And that straightforward encounter of one's feelings immediately shows you the path.

Life is not difficult -- we are making it so because we are cowards: we don't see a thing which we know is there.

I had a friend; we were traveling together and the ticket checker came. I gave him my ticket, and my friend was looking in this pocket and that pocket, and was getting in great trouble.

I asked him, "Why don't you look in this pocket -- on the right side?"

He said, "That is my only hope! If it is not there, then the ticket is lost! So I am afraid to look in that pocket -- first I look everywhere else. That will be the last."

And that is the situation in life: we are not looking because we know that perhaps to face it will be a difficult task. But I know that it's not difficult.

It is always simple to face reality.

And it makes you innocent; and unnecessary complexities don't arise. Otherwise one goes on living in imagination, that one loves, that one can die for the other person.
You cannot even see the other person being happy with someone for a minute -- and you think you can die for the other person!
Just try to see what actually is in you for the other person -- and jealousy will disappear. In most of the cases with jealousy, your love will also disappear. But it is good, because what is the point of having a love which is full of jealousy, which is not love?
If jealousy disappears and love still remains, then you have something solid in your life which is worth having.

Light on the Path

Chapter #27

Chapter title: Dissolving into the universal: a silent song of am-ness

31 January 1986 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1

BELOVED OSHO,

I REMEMBER YOU SAYING ONCE THAT THE GROWTH OF MAN IS DIALECTICAL; AND YOU HAVE ALSO EXPLAINED ABOUT THESIS, ANTITHESIS AND SYNTHESIS. WOULD YOU PLEASE GIVE MORE CLARITY IN THIS REFERENCE ON THE GROWTH TOWARDS ENLIGHTENMENT?

Every growth, growth as such, is dialectical. It needs thesis, antithesis, and synthesis; synthesis again in its turn becomes thesis, and creates antithesis and synthesis -- which again, in its turn, becomes thesis.

That's the way the whole existence works. That's why you find duality everywhere. The duality is thesis and antithesis. One can remain caught between the two, divided, split; there will be no growth. One can make a bridge between the two, and create a new phenomenon: that is synthesis. One can remain at the synthesis; then growth stops there, unless this synthesis again functions as a thesis to produce antithesis, and so on.

For example, you have love and hate. Love is the thesis, hate is the antithesis; and most people die caught in the struggle, conflict, between the two. They are never able to see that there is a subtle connection between love and hate; that they are not two energies but one energy having two polarities. They are just like the negative and positive in electricity -- but it is electricity all the same.

Hate is also a kind of love standing upside down. It happens that you can forget your friend, but you cannot forget your enemy. The enemy haunts you more than the friend. You think more of destroying the enemy than helping the friend. The reason is that love is a thesis -- simple. Hate is an antithesis -- it has become more complicated. It has become negation, and negativity has an attraction -- for many reasons.

One is afraid of negativity because you cannot hate someone without creating a wound within yourself. Nobody pretends hate. It is always authentic, because why should one pretend hate? -- it hurts.

People pretend love; they may not be really in love, but the very idea that they are in love is soothing. So love can remain superficial; but hate always goes deep -- it cannot remain superficial. That's why one becomes more concerned about the enemy than about friends.

The man who is working for enlightenment has to find a bridge between the dualities, because without finding the bridge he cannot transcend them, he cannot go above them. And the bridge is there -- it has only to be discovered. One has to see how love becomes hate, how hate becomes love -- that they are capable of transforming into each other. Naturally, they cannot be different energies; just different situations, states, of the same energy.

As you become aware that love and hate are the same energy, then you are not to be concerned with love and hate, because those are only two poles; you have to be more concerned with the energy of which they are the poles: what is that energy?

Watching it, you start a new force within yourself which is synthesis. You come to a point when you know love and hate are one. This is a great synthesis -- the dualism is finished. But with the finishing of dualism your life comes to a static point. You have grown above love and hate, and there will be a kind of compassion -- that will be the synthesis. You don't hate, you don't love, but you have a certain compassion for both friends and enemies. But compassion again becomes a simple thing.

That's why the synthesis always turns into a thesis -- another beginning. And compassion must have some duality which you can become aware of only when you have achieved compassion.

What is the antithesis of compassion? It is indifference, upekchha. That's the word Buddha has used. It carries more meaning than "indifference." It is a kind of no interest, neither this way nor that way... as if the person does not exist at all for you. Compassion will bring you to indifference.

And all these stages you can find in the growth of different people at the point where they got stuck. For example, the Jaina monks are stuck with indifference. That becomes renunciation, not being bothered with the world.

The Hindu has also become stuck with that, thinking that the world is only a dream; it doesn't matter, you need not be concerned about it. They have grown a little; but at the point of indifference they will start shrinking, they are stuck again. They have to find something between compassion and indifference -- the bridge.

There is a bridge, there is always a bridge in every duality, unless you come to a point which has no duality.

That point is the point of enlightenment.

It has no antithesis, so you cannot even call it thesis; and it is not a synthesis. It has dropped all three -- the whole triangle. It is something beyond the triangle of evolution. And the beauty is, because it is not part of a triangle, you are not stuck. And from that point growth changes its nature completely: it is no longer dialectical.

Before enlightenment, growth is dialectical: always divided, always finding something which joins it and then again another division and another division. But a point comes -- for example between compassion and indifference, the synthesis is equilibrium. The Buddhist word for it is samata.

You are equally balanced, you are neither indifferent nor compassionate, neither leaning to this side nor to that side. Samata can become a point from where the change, the radical change happens in the process of evolution.
Below samata everything is dialectical. You cannot love without hating; they will both go together. One will be conscious, the other will be unconscious; but they are one thing. That's why you can turn them easily: a small incident, and love becomes hate.

The person you were going to die for, you can kill him! Lovers have killed the same person for whom they would have sacrificed themselves. It is the same energy, but it has turned completely upside down.
Samata, equilibrium, has been immensely praised by Gautam Buddha. It simply means absence of any preference -- neither this nor that. You are simply so much in the middle, so absolutely in the middle, that you are almost out of the duality -- samata -- because you have withdrawn your energy from both sides, you are not throwing your energy on any duality.
The whole energy becomes concentrated. In that concentration of your total energy is the possibility of explosion. The small point exactly in the middle cannot contain that much energy, which was spread all over a line divided into many sections, over the whole spectrum. It is almost like an atomic explosion. But it is the atomic explosion in consciousness.
The atom is not material, but a living entity. A living explosion of your energies becomes almost like a lotus flower. The shape of the explosion seen by the enlightened

person is very similar to the shape of the lotus flower. It is because of this that the lotus flower has become symbolic of enlightenment.

From this point things are totally different. There is growth -- growth never stops -- but we cannot call it growth because that may create confusion. Before, it was dualistic; now it is non-dualistic. Before, there was constant conflict; now there is no conflict -- it simply goes on growing. Hence there is absolute silence and great blissfulness, because for the first time you are free of the torture of being caught in two opposing polarities. There is no tension, everything is relaxed, everything is at ease. Rather than calling it growth, it is a let-go.

Now the flow of your life becomes a relaxed phenomenon. There is no end to evolution. Enlightenment is the end of dualistic growth, but the beginning of a non-dual evolution... a peaceful, silent movement of energy which goes on becoming bigger and bigger and goes on losing its separateness from universal energy. It always remains individual, even though it is spread all over the universe. That feeling cannot be expressed by "I" because "I" is just another way of saying "ego." Before enlightenment there was ego; ego can exist only in conflict. This state can be spoken of only as "am"-ness, without any "I." It is a very strange feeling: you are not, and yet you are. You are not your old self; you are no longer a self, but you have not lost the feeling of am-ness.

So the question of what happens to individuals when they dissolve into the universal.... They still remain individuals, but with no assertion of "I" in them... just a silent song of am-ness or isness.

It is as if we put hundreds of candles in this room; all their light will become one. You cannot differentiate in the light -- which part belongs to which candle -- it has become a universal phenomenon. But still, each candle has its own flame, it has a certain individuality. The individuality has not disappeared, but it is very quiet and very silent and very nonassertive. It is almost as if it is nothing, but it is still there.

And that is one of the greatest mysteries: to feel yourself at one with the whole existence and yet know your inner flame... part of the whole, and yet not just a part -- you are also a whole.

The UPANISHADS have a statement: "From the perfect comes the perfect. Yet the perfect left behind still remains as perfect as before" -- nothing is taken away from it. The perfect dissolves into the perfect, but it is not that two perfections become a bigger perfection; it is the same perfection. The emphasis is that it is not a question of quantity, it is a question only of quality.

For example, one hundred candles burning in this room will not make the light heavier; it will be lighter. The change will be qualitative but it will not be quantitative. Each candle will be spread all over the room, and there is going to be no conflict in one hundred candles spreading all over the same space because these are not material bodies.

Just as light... consciousness is even more a quality. Light perhaps has some quantity in it. I think the scientists say that when there is sunlight over five square miles, the light has a little weight, but very small. I don't know what will be the equivalent of five tolas....

SIXTY GRAMS.

Sixty grams. But on five square miles, if we can collect that light, concentrate that light, it moves the weighing scale to sixty grams. So although it seems just non-quantitative, it has a little quantity in it.

But consciousness has no quantity -- five miles or five thousand miles or five million miles, it makes no difference. Awareness has no weight. So infinite awarenesses can exist in the same space without coming into any conflict. And the universe is infinite, so the growth never stops.

But we should remember that it is not the old growth; it is absolutely a new phenomenon. It is as if the first growth was something similar to sexual reproduction: two energies, male and female, negative and positive, thesis and antitheses, creating the birth of a child -- the synthesis. But the second part, after enlightenment, is nonsexual. Your consciousness just goes on expanding; it does not give birth to any child.

That's why I have always condemned Jesus' idea of the only begotten son of God. If God is the ultimate consciousness or equivalent to it, there is no possibility of any birth of a child. And if you accept the birth of a child then the Christian trinity is not right; there has to be a woman as an antithesis to the man.

They have avoided the woman just to discredit her, just not to put her on such a high pedestal as to be part of God; otherwise she becomes divine. But they have forgotten that the child is possible only through duality.

If God is alone, or the ultimate consciousness is alone -- which is a far better and more evolved terminology....

Jainism uses, for the ultimate state of consciousness, kaivalya. It means aloneness. The word "God" is very primitive and childish -- but pure aloneness... and it goes on growing. Its bliss, its joy, its ecstasy goes on growing, knows no limit.

But before it can happen you have to pass through a process of dialectics, because where we are, we are under the law of dialectics. To get free from dialectics is one of the major projects of spiritual evolution.

But it is very easily possible if one works through meditation, because that is the only way to find out the golden mean, the middle point which is transcendence. Buddha even called his whole way "the middle way," because it is always to find exactly the middle point.

The moment you have found the middle point between love and hate, you are beyond both: you have entered into a new area, unexplored. But don't stop until you find something which has no duality to it. Go on and on, searching after each duality for the one point which has no polarity to it; because that is the point between the two growths -- prior to enlightenment and after enlightenment.

So in one way enlightenment is an end, a goal.

In another way it is a beginning, a tremendous beginning.

Question 2

BELOVED OSHO,

WHAT IS ORGASM IN REFERENCE TO MEDITATION AND HIGHER LEVELS OF CONSCIOUSNESS? ISN'T FEELING ORGASMIC IN A DEEP STATE OF MEDITATION TOTALLY NONSEXUAL?

The experience of orgasm itself is always nonsexual. Even though you have achieved it through sex, it itself has no sexuality in it.
You can reach to orgasm through sex. It is a merger of the negative and the positive polarities -- such a deep merger that the man is no longer man, the woman is no longer woman. They are not two; there is only one energy surrounding them both. They have melted into that energy. It may be for a moment -- that does not matter -- but the experience itself has nothing to do with sex.
The first orgasm is bound to be attained through sex. And my own understanding is that meditation has grown out of the experience of orgasm, because the original founders -- particularly Shiva who, in his VIGYAN BHAIRVA TANTRA, has written, just like a scientific formula, about one hundred and twelve meditations; each meditation just in one line or two lines.... The man is tremendously aphoristic. Those one hundred and twelve sutras are just like seeds. He has condensed everything about the method in them.

He is also known as a great lover. Perhaps he was the first man to discover meditation. And it can be very scientifically assumed that whoever experienced orgasm, if he had a little intelligence, would have seen that although it has come through sex, it itself is a nonsexual experience. That gives the insight that there may be possibilities of reaching it through nonsexual means, because it is not sexual itself, so sexuality is not necessarily the only way.

It does not need much intelligence if you experience it and see clearly that it does not have any impact of sexuality. Perhaps sexuality created the background, the groundwork in which it happened. But the experience of orgasm itself does not remind you of sex; it is purely spiritual.

Whoever experienced this must have concluded then that there can be other ways to reach it -- because sex is not necessarily a part of it. There is no color, nor any impression of sex left in it. Then he must have watched how it happens. And then things are very clear: the moment the orgasm happens, time stops, you forget about time. Your mind stops, you do not think anymore. There is tremendous calmness, and a great awareness.

You are not asleep. You have not fallen into any hypnotic sleep. Everything is crystal-clear. The mind is no more functioning the way it functions continuously: the thought process has stopped. The sense of time is not there; it seems timeless. Afterwards you will think it lasted only a few seconds, but that is afterwards; in the experience itself, it seems it is eternity. And you are fully aware, as aware as you have ever been: wide-awake.

Any observer going through the experience will naturally think, "If these things can be managed without sex -- awareness, thoughtlessness, timelessness -- you will reach to the orgasmic state, bypassing sexuality."

And this is my understanding: this is how man must have first discovered meditation; otherwise meditation is not something biological or natural, so that in the course of time you have to discover it. But biology has given you an experience; if you try to understand it, you are bound to search for other methods to make it possible. You know it

has happened -- that there was no thought, no time, and only pure awareness -- so it is possible.

You are not groping in the dark, you are not just guessing: you know it is possible. You have known it through the biological route. Then if these three things can be maintained without sex, the orgasm happens.

And the difference is that the sexual orgasm is very momentary. Although while it is there, it looks almost eternal, that feeling is just because of its depth. But through meditation you can have it as long as you want, because meditation is not dependent on anybody else -- the woman or the man or a certain state of two minds, a certain rhythm of two energies. The sexual orgasm depends on many things, and particularly on the other person being there. Meditation is independent of any other person; only you are to create the situation. And naturally the conclusion will be to start with awareness, because you don't know how else to stop thoughts. It is not in your hands to stop thoughts or to stop time. Only one thing remains, and that is awareness -- that you can be more aware or less aware.

You know it. If this house is suddenly on fire, you will be more aware. You know that your awareness goes up and down. At certain moments you are more aware; at certain moments, less aware. So it is possible to create the situation of being more aware.

That's why awareness became the basis of meditation. And with awareness came the surprise that as you become aware, thoughts disappear. When you are fully aware, there are no thoughts, and suddenly time has stopped. Time can be there inside only with the movement of thoughts.

In fact time can be measured only with some movement. For example, with a watch, how are you measuring time? By the movement of the hands; otherwise, there is no way. If everything is unmoving, you will not be able to think that anything like time exists. But you know that a car has passed, then a train is passing -- there has been a gap. In the gap... it means time. Then you hear the sound of an airplane.... This is movement -- you are finding movement around you.

Inside there is only one movement, and that is of thoughts. When thoughts stop, suddenly time disappears, because time can be measured only through some kind of movement. That's why, if in the night you had many dreams, in the morning you will find that it was a long, long night, because so much movement happened. But if you had no dream at all, you will feel as if you have just fallen asleep, and now you are awake. The night has passed so quickly.

When you are in anxiety, in misery, in pain, time passes slowly because of your pain. You would like the pain to pass quickly, but with your expectation that the pain is not going, time is passing very slowly.

But when you are meeting a friend after years, you find hours have passed, and it seems just minutes since you met. When you are joyful, when you are miserable, it makes a difference in the speed of time immediately. But when you are neither -- just silent -- time has no way to move.

So as one becomes aware, first one finds thoughts becoming less, and finally stopping. Then he finds time is not there -- and he has found the key to the basic meditation. Then all other meditations are differentiations

of the same method, different combinations of the same method. Different combinations, but essentially they are awareness or witnessing.

And it seems there is no other way to find it except through sexual orgasm, because that is the only experience in life given by nature that comes close to meditation. And the misery is that millions of people have no experience of orgasm, and all the religions have been preventing them from having that experience.

This is so ridiculous, because if they don't have any orgasmic experience, meditation remains just a fiction; or maybe some giants can do it. "But we are human beings -- it is not possible for us to be more aware. How can one be more aware? We are aware as much as we can be. How to stop thoughts?"

And the responsibility for keeping humanity away from meditation goes to all the religions because they are against sex. They have prevented people -- not from sex but from orgasm, because they have poisoned people's sex with guilt. They could not prevent sex, but they did not allow people to be playful about it, they did not allow people to be respectful about it, they did not allow people to go deeper into it.

On the contrary, because sex is sin, it makes people feel guilty. The man is in a hurry to finish as quickly as possible, because you should not continue any sin too long. Knowing that you are doing something wrong, you want to do it quickly and be finished with it.

And if the man is in a hurry he cannot attain to orgasm, only to ejaculation; which proves all the religious teachers right -- that you are wasting your energy. Because the man

feels he gains nothing, it is a waste, he feels tired. The next day he may have a headache, feels dull, is not so sharp. Perhaps the religious people are right -- he is already punished.

So it is a very strange thing. They have created the idea of guilt, and the idea of guilt on its own has given proofs that you really are doing something wrong.

The woman has remained unmoving while making love, because she has been told that to enjoy herself while making love -- or to move, or to be playful -- is only for prostitutes, not for ladies. Ladies simply lie down almost dead, thinking, "Let him do what he wants to do and let him be finished soon" -- because they don't gain anything out of it.

The man at least finds a certain release of the energy with which he was becoming burdened, but the woman does not get even that release. So naturally women are more against sex than men. And every woman thinks in her mind that all men are nothing but animals: their only desire is sex.

This is the by-product of all the religious teachings. In this way... they have not been able to prevent sex; otherwise humanity would have disappeared. And orgasm is not necessary for reproduction, so biology has no problem: it can continue its work without orgasm.

Orgasm was not something necessary for reproduction, it was something to open a window for the higher evolution of consciousness.

But the idiots who have been religious leaders and priests prevented that window. They have been teaching continuously: "Meditate!" And when people fail, when they cannot attain to meditation, then the priests say, "You are

sinners -- how can you attain? First be celibate, fast, do penance."

And all these things will prevent people from having orgasm -- which is the only natural way to have a first glimpse of meditation.

So you can understand my difficulty. If I say to people, "You have been prevented by your religious people from becoming religious," they cannot understand what I am saying. But what I am saying is absolutely scientific.

There must be something in man's nature that opens a window towards higher evolution; otherwise how can you convince the man that there are things like higher experiences? And how did the first man come to know? Why did he meditate in the first place, and how did he find the way to meditate?

Somebody, somewhere in the past, must have found some similarity with his nature, and must have seen that, although he passes through sex, he reaches to a point where sex has nothing to do with it: sex simply opens a door into a new reality. And that door can be opened without sex far more easily, without dependence.

It is one of the great misfortunes that has befallen humanity, that sex became taboo, prohibited, rejected, condemned. They did not succeed in preventing it, but they certainly succeeded in poisoning man's spiritual growth.

So it is not only the orgasm that you experience in meditation which is nonsexual, even the orgasm that you experience through sex is nonsexual.

Orgasm itself is a nonsexual experience.

The natural way, the easier way, the primary way is through sex -- and it is perfectly good; it is in accordance

with nature's intentions. And then you know that such an experience is possible for you. Then you can play with the experience, and you can find many ways to reach it.
All those ways have become meditations. And that does not prohibit you from using the sexual way, because it is sex that has given you the first experience of orgasm, has given you the first insight into meditation, has taken you far away from biology and nature.
So one should be grateful to one's sexuality.
There should be no question of guilt.
If religions had taught people to be grateful to sex, we would have produced a totally different kind of man -- not this miserable and suffering creature that you see all around the world.
We could have produced really joyful, blissful people; people who would have forgotten how to be miserable, how to suffer, who would have forgotten completely the anguish in which they are living now.

Light on the Path

Chapter #28
Chapter title: Act according to your insight
2 February 1986 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
WE FIND THAT MANY INTELLIGENT PEOPLE, LIKE SCIENTISTS, PHILOSOPHERS, AND EVEN POLITICIANS, EXPRESS GREAT ADMIRATION AND

RESPECT FOR US INDIVIDUALLY AND FOR THE WAY WE LIVE TOGETHER -- BUT THEY REFUSE TO UNDERSTAND THAT WE POINT TO YOU AS THE SOURCE OF THIS. WHERE IS THE BLOCK?

It is very simple to understand.
To admire you is not difficult. In admiring you they are still higher than you. They are great intellectuals, scientists, politicians, artists, and their admiration in no way hurts their ego -- in fact it fulfills it.
But if you point towards me as the source of your lifestyle, of your individuality, of your way of being, them they will not be able to admire it. Then a tremendous jealousy arises. They cannot put me down; they can only accept me as a higher source than their own intelligence -- and that's where the trouble is.
It is better not to point to me; and have a good relation with all those people. If you point to me then you immediately hurt their egos. They cannot accept me because I am hitting at the very sources of their conditioning. I am not accepting their intellectuality as intelligence. I don't care about their Nobel Prizes, because those are all political games.
I have no respect for any politician in the world because all politicians are mentally sick, and they are suffering from an inferiority complex.
So if you point to me then certainly you hurt them, offend them. There is no need to do that. If they are admiring you, it is perfectly good. They expect to be admired by you in response. They cannot expect to be admired by me. Even if they admire me I am going to hit against their conditionings

which are basically wrong, and which have lead humanity into a mess.
So it is better not to mention my name.

Question 2
BELOVED OSHO,
GURDJIEFF SAID, "BLESSED ARE THOSE WHO REMAIN WHERE THEY ARE. BLESSED ARE THOSE WHO WALK ON THE WAY, AND GO TO THE END -- BUT WOE TO THEM WHO STOP IN BETWEEN."
OSHO, YOUR WORLD TOUR, ESPECIALLY TO EUROPE, IS A TURNING POINT FOR MANY OF US. IT SEEMS THAT WITHOUT YOU WE'VE STOPPED IN BETWEEN.
PLEASE COMMENT.

Gurdjieff is right, but I will not agree totally with his first statement, "Blessed are those who remain where they are." They are simply idiots.
They may not be in misery, they may not be in great turmoil and anguish, but they are not blessed.
I agree with the two other statements: "Blessed are those who travel to the end -- but woe to those who are stuck somewhere in the middle."
Getting stuck in the middle is a very difficult situation. You have lost the world, and your roots in it, where everybody else lives; and you have not found a new world, new roots where you wanted to live. So you are without any roots, without any nourishment. You cannot go back, because that which is left is left, that which you have known as nonsense is now nonsense -- you cannot make it sensible again.

So going back is impossible. And you are stuck in the middle because you are not finding guidance how to go ahead to the end.

Not much guidance is needed on my path, but as far as Gurdjieff is concerned, he is right. Without him his disciples will be stuck because he has never given a clear-cut direction to anyone. He has spoken in puzzles, and only he knows how to make any sense of them. So unless he is with the disciples, they are really in a state of woe -- they are cursed. He has taken them out of their homes and there is no new home where they can be.

But with me it is totally different: I have not been giving you detailed directions. You don't need me the way Gurdjieff is needed by his followers -- because I feel that kind of need is a sort of spiritual slavery.

My whole effort has been to tell you the whole truth.

You are feeling a little puzzled, not because you don't know how to go forward; your puzzlement is coming from missing the nourishment that my love and my presence can give you, not from a lack of guidance.

And particularly at this moment... because the whole effort of Anand Sheela and her gang was to create a very centered hierarchy, so everything got directed from above. And people like it, because that gives them freedom from responsibility. They are no longer responsible: whatever happens, the source of guidance is responsible -- but simultaneously they are becoming slaves.

Seeing this I had to come out of silence, because it was absolutely against my work. I want a deconcentrated world of sannyasins. They should be given a clear-cut direction,

understanding. Their responsibility should not be taken away.
They remain responsible.
They remain free.
They remain their own masters.
And that's what I am trying to do now -- undoing everything that, in those four years when I was in silence, has been done to you. And it is not a difficult job to undo it.
I would like all the communes that want to continue to be autonomous: not dependent on any central world headquarters; related, but not dependent; related just because they are sannyasins. The world headquarters is their headquarters. It is not somebody else dominating them and making them do things whether they like it or not.
There are communes which are not satisfied with remaining together -- they can disperse. They can have smaller groups, small centers, small ashramas. There are individuals who would like to remain individuals, not part of any collective group -- they should be allowed, because my work is an individual work.
Gurdjieff called his work "school" work. The individuals don't count. The whole school together is needed.
To me, each individual is enough unto himself. He lacks nothing -- just a little understanding of himself, a little awareness, a little more consciousness, of which everybody is capable.
And this is the purpose of my having a world tour -- to make you aware that you are not dependent on anyone, that you are not part of any school work, that my approach is individualistic, that I want each individual to be absolutely independent in his spiritual growth.

And it is far easier than school work, but it depends on what kinds of methods are used. Gurdjieff was using the methods he had collected from the Sufis -- they are all school methods: the individual has to surrender completely to the group. The group evolves, and with the group the individual evolves. If the group is stuck, then the individual is stuck. Then there is no way for the individual to find his own way, because from the very beginning it was a kind of collective growth.

My work differs totally from Gurdjieff's. It is individual from the very beginning. Even though you are living in a commune, it is not that you are part of the commune -- no. On the contrary, the commune is simply a name: it has no existence of itself. Because you love each other and you feel to be together... it is just living together.

But your work remains individual.

Your growth remains individual.

And remember this, that the final freedom is possible only if from the very first step you are free. If you are not free from the very first step, you cannot hope for the last step to be out of freedom, because the last step is essentially the growth of the first step. What was a seed at the first step has come to a flowering at the last step.

No sannyasin needs to feel that he is stuck in the middle. But right now the feeling may be there because I removed all the structure that was created to have a centralized system about everything -- erasing individuality, dissolving it into collectivity. So there is a gap right now.

So I want to meet all the sannyasins around the world to tell them, "You need not be worried at all. Wherever you are you can start growing individually."

And it is beautiful not to depend on others. It is dangerous to have a centralized system. It is efficient, but it is dangerous. It is efficient like any machine, but it reduces human beings to robots. Their individuality is not respected. They are respected as a part, as a cog in the wheel, but in themselves they are just a cog, of no use. Their use is only in the wheel. If they fit in the centralized system completely, then they are useful, and they will be praised, and they will be rewarded.

It is good for politicians to work that way; it is good for dictators to work that way -- and there is some element of dictatorship in George Gurdjieff.

It is not just a coincidence that Josef Stalin and George Gurdjieff were born in the same place -- the Caucasus. Both were Caucasians; both have the same tradition; both grew in the same kind of atmosphere; and both were really hard men. That's why Josef Stalin got the name "Stalin." It is not his real name. "Man of steel" -- that is the meaning of Stalin.

And the same was the situation with Gurdjieff, who was even far stronger than Josef Stalin. But they are coming from the same stock. Nobody has bothered to look into their backgrounds. They studied in the same monastery. They grew up in the same environment. They have the same kind of blood and the same kind of tradition. Their past is exactly the same.

And the first effort of Josef Stalin, after the revolution, was to kill Gurdjieff. Gurdjieff had to escape from Russia. Gurdjieff was not in politics, and there was no need for Stalin to be concerned about him, but the concern was that such a strong man cannot be tolerated -- it is dangerous. He

is the same type and more powerful and any time he can create some difficult situation.

The first group that was around Gurdjieff was all Russian -- the refugees who had escaped from Russia because of the revolution; Ouspensky was a Russian.... The whole first group was of Russians. That too is symbolic, because the whole of Russia was turning into a dictatorship.

Although these people had escaped, they had the same type of conditioning and the same kind of mind. And they had not escaped from dictatorship, they had escaped because they had enough money. And that was the trouble -- that it would be distributed.

So with all their money they escaped from Russia. This was the first group around Gurdjieff. And he created a small, dictatorial group. It was absolutely dictatorial: whatever he said had to be done. There was no question of any discussion, no question of the other individual thinking about it, no question of freedom. Even things that were absurd had to be done because Gurdjieff said so.

You can see, anybody can see, it is absurd -- but that was his way of working. He managed to use a dictatorial system to create a few really beautiful people, but none of them ever became enlightened. He created very strong people, very beautiful people; but if you look deeply into it, their strength was not of humbleness, their strength was of willpower. It was not of egolessness, it was of the ego.

And all the methods of Gurdjieff strengthen the ego. They make it as strong, as powerful as possible. One feels one is moving, growing, but none of his followers has reached to enlightenment. A man like Gurdjieff has failed for the simple reason that everything was centralized: his word

was law, and nobody could argue about it. There was no question of freedom. He wanted everybody to melt into the group completely -- and the group was absolutely in his hands.

It also reminds me of another failure -- and that is of J. Krishnamurti. Gurdjieff failed because he destroyed the individual completely and made him only a part of a collectivity, and the collective soul had to grow.

Krishnamurti is on the other extreme. He left the individual completely free -- so much so that of those who have been following his teachings for almost sixty years, none of them has had the benefit of the love of the master, the presence of the master.

Krishnamurti has given freedom, but he has removed himself totally out of your existence. Gurdjieff catches hold of you totally; and Krishnamurti leaves you totally -- so totally that even his presence, his love, is not to be a support in moments when you start wobbling or in states when you start feeling discouraged. You can expect no help from him.

Gurdjieff was a dictator. Krishnamurti is not even a friend, he is simply indifferent. What happens to you is your business, he is not concerned. His concern ends the moment he has said what he wanted to say. His concern is with his teaching but not with the real individuals. He is not in love with the people who surround him. He will not give even that much warmth that can keep you on the path in the nights when it is very cold.

These are extremes -- Gurdjieff and Krishnamurti -- and extremes always fail. They fail for different reasons,

diametrically opposite reasons, but they fail in the same way.
I am exactly in the middle.
I don't want to dictate to you in detail the whole program of your life. But I want to be close to you in case you fall, in case you need warmth, in case just a gesture of love will keep you moving on the way.
I will not take your freedom from you, because I want you to be ultimately free. But that does not mean that I have to be cold towards you.
So I will be coming.
And I don't see that there is any great problem -- just a little chaos. And out of this chaos something good will happen. I could have remained silent and there would have been no chaos, but then I was seeing that you were being exploited; that you were working twelve hours, fourteen hours a day; that your whole life had become devoted to restaurants, discos....
There was no time for meditation. There was no inspiration for meditation. In fact, there was positively a condemnation of anybody who wanted time for meditation, time for friends or lovers... wanted to play his guitar. He was thought to be sabotaging the system. He was thrown out. So all creativity was being destroyed.
The commune had become just a money-creating mechanism, and the sannyasins were being used just as slaves.
It was difficult for me. I had tried it -- to make those people understand that this was not the reason why the communes were brought about. I had tried to explain what my idea of the commune was, and said that this was not what was

happening: "You may be earning money, you may be having houses, you may be making roads -- but that is not going to lead people to enlightenment. Those roads don't go to enlightenment!

"People's whole energy is being involved in it, and you have almost created a system which is cheating them. You are telling them, `Work is worship, so you don't need any other meditation. The work is your meditation.'"

And the people thought this must be my direction. It was not. When I failed completely to convince those people to change.... They could not change because they had no interest in meditation. They had an interest in having a big empire in the world, having big money, having great power.

They did not want me to speak again.

That was the breaking point -- why Sheela left; otherwise there was no reason for her to leave. She did not want me to speak again because she understood clearly that if I spoke again it would be a disturbance to the system she was creating. She could stop others but she could not stop me. And when I am speaking to my people, who is going to listen to her and her group?

So, because their whole system that they had created in four, five years, has been destroyed, you are feeling in chaos. But you are not stuck anywhere. You were stuck in that mechanism that was created; and if I had remained silent, you would have remained stuck -- working your whole life... reaching nowhere.

So before I help you to stand on your own, as individuals.... Whether you are in the commune or outside the commune, the individuality has not to be lost.

Freedom is one of the basic values.
Meditation has to be our innermost life.
Then whether you are living together in a small group or a big group does not matter. But these things should be preserved.
Remembering these things, you can live in a commune, or if you feel that the bigger group destroys these things.... It is difficult, because the bigger group has its own problems. Finance is one of the problems, because many sannyasins who join the commune have not contributed any money to the commune. Then the commune has to work more because they have to be fed, and they have to be clothed, and they have to be housed.
And if you start... the bigger the commune, the more the problems will be -- which are unnecessary. You will be in conflict with society. The politicians will become afraid of you, that you are so numerous that you can be dangerous to them. Then other religions may start feeling afraid of you, and they may start creating trouble, with cases in the courts -- baseless, but they will waste time, they will waste money.
And they will finally get you involved in such situations that you don't have any time to play your guitar, sing a song, or just sit silently for a few hours. And that was your main idea in being part of the commune!
This is something to be remembered -- it has always happened. People had come together with a very beautiful idea, but then they get involved in something else, and there is no time for the basic idea so they go on postponing it. By and by they forget about it. Finally they are simply running discos or restaurants. But that you could have done

without becoming a sannyasin. That was not the purpose of being a sannyasin.
There are discos and there are restaurants, there are hotels -- so what is the point?
You had not become a sannyasin to run a hotel.
So I want to see all the sannyasins, meet them, and make them aware what the purpose was for their becoming a sannyasin: that should never be lost sight of.
If it can be fulfilled in a commune, the commune is good. If it can be fulfilled only in smaller groups, then smaller groups are good. If it can be fulfilled better when you live individually, alone -- so that then you have to work only six hours a day, five days a week, and the remaining time is totally free for you....
And to make it feasible I have allowed that you can now use any color of clothes; you can use the mala or you may not use the mala, as the situation permits.... Because if it comes against your job, if just because of your orange clothes you are thrown out from a school where you had a good job -- where almost six months were holidays, and each year you have longer two-month holidays, when you could have always come to me....
And that was happening in Poona. People were coming to me every year, once or twice. And they were earning enough, working less time, earning more, and having more freedom. Once they had done their work -- six hours -- they were free for the remaining eighteen hours. They were coming once or twice a year to Poona; remaining there for two or three months, and then going back.
The same people, when they started communes, became so involved, and financially it became so difficult for them,

that for four years many of them had not come to me. They wanted to come but in the commune they didn't have money in their hands, they didn't earn. The money was centralized in the commune -- and the commune had its own needs.

The commune does not have a preference for your need to go and be with me for two months -- and it cannot afford it either. And you are working twice the amount of time you have ever worked; and you are without any money. You are left with no time of your own; and you have got into so many troubles -- financial, legal, social, political -- that it is just wasting your life.

So if some commune is going successfully, and the people who are there are absolutely happy and contented, it is good. If some commune is going into bankruptcy and still they are pulling through somehow, they are breaking their own necks unnecessarily. Then it is better to let it go bankrupt -- and you move alone, be separate.

There were hundreds of small centers which have been destroyed by the group who wanted to make as many big communes as possible, because those small centers could not earn much, could not produce much. Now the whole priority has become totally different from my idea.

It was beautiful -- somebody was running a small center in his own home. He enjoyed it, he loved it that people came to his home to meditate. And people had no worry about making a place where they could meditate. They destroyed all the small centers and moved people into communes. The whole idea lost touch with my basic attitude.

So I will be coming and reminding you why you have become a sannyasin. And that remains the priority;

everything else is secondary. There can be communes, there can be small ashramas, there can be centers, and there can be individual sannyasins. And this way more people will be meditating, more people will be independent, more people will be able to come close to me.

First I want to have a world tour so I can talk to everybody and bring them out of the unnecessary chaos. And second, I am not going to live in a commune anymore, but I will be living in a place where five hundred people at least can be accommodated all the year round. So people can come and be there for two months, three months, and can go; other people can come and go.

We will dissolve those four ceremonies and make the whole year a festival -- a three-hundred-and-sixty-five-day festival. So it is continuous; people go on changing but it is continuous. So people don't lose touch with me -- they don't need to be directed in detail about everything, but they need to be given a clear insight so they can find out for themselves what to do as far as details are concerned. Gurdjieff was giving even small details; you were not even free about that. Krishnamurti is not even bothered about giving you an insight so you can find what you have to do. My own situation is that I don't want to interfere in your freedom in any way. Still, I don't want to leave you alone in the darkness, in the cold. Whatever I can do with my love and with my presence and with my words, I will do.

And you are not in any way becoming obliged to me. On the contrary, I am obliged that you allowed me to give you a helping hand, that you allowed me to be close enough, that you allowed me to make some clarity possible for your eyes -- you could have rejected it. It was out of your

freedom that you have allowed me -- it does not interfere with your freedom.
So now the whole year will be the festival.
And the whole world will be our commune.
Every sannyasin will be carrying the smallest commune in his heart.
So there will be some bigger communes, and some even bigger communes, but the priority of your growth has not to be lost sight of.

Question 3
BELOVED OSHO,
YOU SAID THAT ONLY A TOTAL DISCONTINUITY FROM THE PAST CAN CREATE A NEW MAN. HOW CAN THIS HAPPEN IN PRACTICAL TERMS?

It looks difficult. It looks almost impossible, but it only looks so; otherwise it is very simple. You just have to watch within yourself what the connection is you are keeping with the old -- and why you are keeping it. Is it just a habit because from the very childhood you have been taught certain concepts, ideas, certain religions, cults, creeds? -- or is there some nourishment that you get from them? Or, on the contrary, are they sucking your blood? You just have to see within yourself about each thing -- whether it is political, social, or religious -- that you have carried from the past; that the past has given to you through education, and through other means in the society. You just have to see what the reason is that you are still holding on to it.

And my experience is that nobody is being nourished by it, so there is no reason to hold on to it.
Almost everybody is sucked by the dead, the old, the past. It does not allow you to be new, young, contemporary. It keeps pulling you back. It is not something friendly to you -- you have just never looked at it and seen that you are carrying enemies within you, parasites within you. And you are simply carrying them because of old habits, because they have always been there -- as long as you can remember they have been there. As long as you can remember you have been a Christian, or a Hindu, or a Mohammedan.
It is just a question of habit.
So you have to see exactly what traditions and past inheritances are doing to you. You have to be very clear-cut, and then the thing is very simple. If you see that you are carrying parasites just because of old habits, that you are nourishing your own enemies who are destroying your life, your youth, your newness -- who are making you almost dead before death comes -- it won't take any great effort not to cling to them. You will simply drop them, there is not much of a question. It is your decision to keep them or not to keep them. You will simply drop them.
The moment you see that you are carrying poison, something destructive, which is going to spoil everything in your life -- not because I say so; you have to see it with your own eyes -- then it is so easy to get rid of the past. And the moment you are discontinuous with the past, you have immense freedom to grow.
Suddenly you are fresh and young, free of the parasites, free of the burden, free of an unnecessary load, luggage

which was nothing but junk. But you were carrying it because your fathers, your forefathers, everybody was carrying it.
It is simply a question of seeing what the past is doing to you.
Is it a friend or an enemy?
And just the insight will do the work.
I have heard about one patient who was having his session with the psychoanalyst. The psychoanalyst had been trying hard for months to convince him that his whole sickness was imaginary. His sickness was that he was feeling continuously that strange creatures were crawling all over his body; and all the time he was just throwing them off. And there was nothing.
For months the psychoanalyst was telling him that there was nothing: "You just look. I don't see anything -- and you go on throwing off those strange creatures which are just your imagination." But the man had no time even to listen. While the psychoanalyst was talking he was just throwing... from all over the body.
In this session he was sitting very close to the psychoanalyst. And as he started throwing off his strange creatures, the psychoanalyst said, "Wait! Don't throw them on me!" Because for six months, trying to convince him, the psychoanalyst himself had become convinced that there must be something there -- because this man is intelligent, he is a professor, and if he goes on throwing off those things, there must be something there. So he said, "Wait! You can throw them anywhere else, but you can't throw them on ME."

The psychoanalyst himself became convinced: "And I don't want to deal any more with you, because I have started suspecting, once in a while, that some strange creature is crawling on me. I know that it is just imagination, but...."
You have to see that even imagination starts being active. Seeing certainly is action. You don't have to do anything after seeing. You see it, and that very moment you are disconnected from the thing if it is not nourishing you but torturing you. It is very simple.
And it is one of the most fundamental things... to get rid of the whole past, to be absolutely discontinuous with it. Then you have a simplicity, a lightness, because there is no load. And you have a health of mind, of soul -- which was sucked away, so that you had never had any experience of it.
You feel new vitality and new blood running through your veins. And because you are now discontinuous with the past, you don't have memories, psychological memories. If you want to remember, you can remember, but they are no longer a force on you. They don't have any power over you so you have to remember them.
Now there are no memories, no connections with the past. You have only the present, and you have a vast future. Of course you cannot do anything in the future, you can only do anything you want to do in the present. But it goes on: as the future becomes the present, your growth, your action, your intelligence, your creativity -- anything that you are working at -- keeps growing.
And the pleasure of growth is immense.
To be stuck somewhere is one of the most horrible feelings.

Leo Tolstoy used to have a dream which tortured him his whole life -- and it can torture anybody, that kind of dream. And it was not that he had it once, it was almost every night, the same dream -- which is very rare. Very few people see the same dream, unless the dream is so significant that the unconscious has to remind you that you have to do something.

His dream was that he sees a vast desert -- as far as he can see it is desert... sand and sand and nothing else. Hot sun... the sand is almost burning. And two shoes -- they are his shoes -- are walking. He is not in them -- that was the most horrible thing -- just the shoes going on and on, and the desert is endless. So the whole night may pass and the shoes are walking on, and the desert never comes to an end. There is nobody in those shoes, but the shoes are his. And he would always wake up perspiring, trembling.

This was his lifelong torture; and he was stuck with the dream. There was no way to move. He even started becoming afraid of going to sleep because he knew what was going to happen: the moment he falls asleep, the dream will be there. And it goes nowhere -- just simply goes on and on. He talked to one of his friends, Chekhov -- he was another great, creative novelist of the same caliber as Tolstoy -- about the dream.

Chekhov said, "Unless you do something, the dream will continue, because the dream wants you to do something. It is about you. And even in your dream you are trying to deceive yourself -- that's why you are not in your own shoes, so only the shoes have to walk. But the shoes are yours and you are in them. And this is something about

your life. Anybody can see it -- there is no need of any great psychoanalyst to analyze it."

Tolstoy had a wife who was a constant torture, but he was a man of no decision: he could not decide whether to divorce her or to continue. He had many children, and he lived like a poor man. He was a Christian, a practicing Christian. Although he was a count and had immense riches and had thousands of acres of land, he lived like a poor man, ate like a poor man, had clothes like a poor man.

His wife lived like a princess and tortured him continually because he was being stupid: trying to practice Christianity by being poor because, "Blessed are the poor." She would not even take him to social parties, to meetings, or to the royal family -- no. She could not even stand to see him in his rags. And he had made himself a buffoon -- the whole town laughed about it: "This is stupid. We have seen Christians -- but that does not mean that you have to live like this."

And this man was one of the greatest creative novelists of the whole world; but he had no decisiveness about anything. Either renounce everything... but what is the point of living in a palace and wearing rags? having all his money in a bank account and never using it because he has to live like a poor man?

So he was torturing himself, he was being tortured by the wife, he was being taunted by everybody -- and he belonged to the highest strata of the society. Even the czar, the king of Russia, was continually taunting him: "What are you doing? We are also Christians, but that does not mean.... And if you really want to be a Christian, then renounce everything -- be a Christian!"

But the trouble with him was his indecisiveness. And that was his dream: that there is a desert, and he knows there is nothing else except this desert; it is hot and it is burning, and there is no end to this misery. The shoes go on walking -- and only the shoes. That is very significant.

It seems as if deep down he does not want to be poor, deep down he does not want to live the way he is living. Just mentally he has got the idea that he has to be poor. So he is not in the shoes but the shoes are his -- that he can see absolutely. And the day Chekhov analyzed his dream, that very night he left the palace and went far away in a train to one of his small farms, which was in the forest, to live there. That was the only night -- in the train -- that the dream did not appear.

But he was not young anymore. He was very old, he was weak, he could not live the life of a monk, of austerity. On the small station... he arrived in the morning, and the farm was far away; it was difficult for him to walk to the farm. So he was waiting for some vehicle.

The stationmaster said, "By the evening some vehicle comes which takes the post office things, and it passes through your farm, so you can go in it."

But he died on the station platform, on a bench waiting for the vehicle. But before dying he was happy because that dream had not occurred, and a great weight had disappeared from his chest.

So the moment you see something, don't be indecisive. Act according to your insight, and life is very simple and immensely beautiful. We just have to be clear about what has to be left behind, what is unnecessary to carry; and

what has to be done: that which you feel, not because Jesus says, or Buddha says, or anybody else says.
But what you feel like doing -- do it. Take the whole responsibility of doing it on yourself. And there is nothing much in it. You will be discontinuous with the past. And you will be the New Man.
Everybody has the capacity to be the New Man or to remain the old. Just a clear insight and action according to the insight is needed.
This much courage is certainly needed.
I think that even though Leo Tolstoy died on a railway station as a beggar on a bench, he died very peacefully, very blissfully. In his whole life this was the first time he had taken a decision -- and the dream had disappeared.
It was simply an unconscious reminder, continuously, "Do something; you are unnecessarily caught in a net -- you can get out of it. Nobody is holding you, you are simply sitting there."

Question 4
BELOVED OSHO,
THE COMMUNE IS NO MORE; OR, EVERY SANNYASIN IS THE COMMUNE. BUT WHAT ABOUT SUCH INSTITUTIONS AS THE ACADEMY, OR FRIENDS, WHICH TAKES CARE OF THE PUBLICATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF YOUR WORDS? DO THEY STILL HAVE A FUNCTION, AND HOW CAN THEY FUNCTION?

They still have a function -- and they will continue to function -- but their function is not dictatorial. Their

function is to serve the whole world of sannyasins and the people who love me.
So their function is not to govern you, their function is to serve you.
And they are not organizations, they are simply institutes. And their function has become more important now, because for all the languages that books are being translated into, it has to be seen to it that they are not mistranslated -- that the translation is right, that it does not harm the spirit of the message.
So it is a great work to take care of all the languages -- we need the publication institute to check all the language publications before they are published.
Now there are many countries.... Just yesterday, a Korean woman was here, and she informed us that more than thirty of my books are translated into Korean, and thousands of copies are available in all the bookstalls all over the country. We have to take care of things. There are countries which are not members of the Bern Convention: they do not believe in copyright. Korea is one of those that do not believe in copyright, so they can translate any book, publish any book.
But we can at least keep an eye that the translation is done rightly, that the person who is doing the translation understands me. It is not only a question of copyright, it is a question that I should not be presented in a wrong way -- which is possible. Because if they are just earning money, who cares whether the translation is right or wrong?
I informed the woman, "You send..." Because we don't even know: it may be happening in other countries. There are many countries which are not under the copyright

convention. But we can help them, we can suggest to them, "We don't want any money from you, any royalty from you, but we would like you to represent every book exactly, without any distortion." And in many countries we will have to take publication into our own hands.

For example, it happened in England that one of the presses had published eight or ten books. We came to know later on that it was a Christian press, but to us it was not a problem. To them it became a problem, because when I spoke against Christianity, they simply pulled out all those books that they had published before -- books which have nothing to do with Christianity -- and informed us that they could not publish our books anymore.

The same has happened in Holland -- another publisher, and for the same reason. When I was speaking on Christ, they had published twelve or fifteen books, and now because I have criticized him, they have simply stopped selling the books. They have informed us, "We will not sell them, and we will not publish any more books because ours is a Christian organization."

So it is going to happen everywhere sooner or later. Somebody will be a Mohammedan publisher, somebody will be a Hindu publisher, somebody will be a Christian publisher. So sooner or later we will have to take all our publication into our own hands. We will not be able to give it to others -- they will not be ready.

So the Academy, and Friends International, they will still have their functions: publication, keeping contact with all the sannyasins of the world -- not control but contact; otherwise all contact will be lost.

There is a need for an institute that keeps all the contacts, all the addresses, all the names of sannyasins; where they are, what they are doing. If we need them in some other place.... For example, if we want to keep an eye on all the languages, then we will need people with different languages to be in one place, at the headquarters.

So Friends International will be the headquarters for communication for all the sannyasins. If I am traveling around the world, then somebody, some agency, is needed to inform you where I am; otherwise I may pass through your country and you may not even know.

This is possible, because just now the pope has informed all the Christian publications in Italy, as he heard that I am coming to Italy, that they are not to give me any publicity -- neither positive nor negative. They are not to even mention my name. Now, in Italy the pope has great powers -- political powers -- over the government and over the media. We will need our own media, our own agencies, our own publications to inform you. And for any information that you want, you need headquarters from where you can get that information; otherwise it will become impossible even for you to find out where I am.

But their function is not to govern you; their function is to serve you, just to make me available to you as accurately as possible.

We may need our own radio station somewhere, we may need our own television stations, because these people are going to be cutting off all sources, so that I cannot reach the public.

Now there are countries like Germany who have already made laws that I cannot enter their country. Others may

follow in the same way if they see that I am traveling around the world. Then they simply won't let me in.
And there are political pressures, religious pressures. So we need our own independent media which can continue to inform you and other people -- so these people cannot do any harm.
Now their only fear is that my words will reach people. This is a great victory for us. That means they have an absolute certainty that they cannot argue: they have no valid arguments against me. Such steps are only taken when you cannot argue; otherwise, what is the need?
So this is the world we are in -- which is dominated everywhere by rotten ideologies that have no logical support. And they will be trying to prevent us everywhere. And it is so easy.
So before they start preventing us, we have to have our own arrangements. So rather than making a commune, my effort is now just to have a perfect publication department for all the languages possible, a satellite somewhere so we can manage radio stations all over the world without any difficulty, and headquarters from where you can get all the information -- and through which people can be made aware of where sannyasins are.
I will be living at the headquarters, and we will make arrangements for people so that they can come and be with me. If countries stop me from entering, then the only way is that I should be in some place where my sannyasins are close by, and they can come and be with me.
So we have to have these small groups which are not a centralization of power, but are only functionally serving the whole sannyas commune around the world.

And now every sannyasin is a small commune.

Light on the Path
Chapter #29
Chapter title: Nietzsche: a great freedom or a great danger
3 February 1986 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
THERE IS A REVIVAL OF INTEREST IN NIETZSCHE ALL OVER EUROPE, FROM BOTH THE PRE-AND POST-WAR GENERATIONS. NIETZSCHE'S APPEAL SEEMS TO LIE IN HIS VIEWS STILL BEING CONTEMPORARY.
COULD YOU PLEASE COMMENT?

It is good news.
Friedrich Nietzsche is one of the philosophers with the most potential in the whole world, not only in the West, not only in Germany. His insights are significant for everybody. But he was misunderstood by all his contemporaries.
That's the usual fate of every genius.
It is almost routine, not an exception but a rule, that the genius is bound to be misunderstood by his contemporaries, for the simple reason that he is far ahead of his time. So there is always a revival after the death of a genius. It may take one hundred years, two hundred years, but a genius always has a revival.

It is unfortunate that by the time people start understanding him, he is no more. And he suffers the misunderstandings all around him his whole life. He lives almost alone, with no communication with his contemporaries; and by the time he is being understood, he is no more. He never comes to know the people who will understand him.

So it was absolutely certain that Friedrich Nietzsche would have a great revival, and his words and his insights would be echoed all over the world -- not only in the world of philosophy, but in the world of religion, morality, aesthetics. Whatever he touched, he always brought something absolutely new to it.

And that's the trouble -- because for thousands of years people have understood a thing in a certain way. When a person like Nietzsche turns all the tables -- which centuries have founded -- and alone, single-handedly, fights against the whole past, it is a very difficult situation -- and more so for a Western philosopher who has no understanding of meditation.

He naturally gets very frustrated. It is bound to bring him insanity -- the misunderstanding of the people. Everybody misunderstands him. In the world full of millions of people, there is not a single person with whom he can have a heart-to-heart contact, communion. He is in a desert -- it drives him mad. That's what happened with Nietzsche.

He lived a life of immense frustration, because he was giving great insights to the world; and in return -- only condemnation. He was bringing new light -- and not a single friendly response.... Even his friends were not friendly about his philosophical approaches. That finally drove Nietzsche to madness; he died a madman.

His death in madness is a condemnation of the whole Western approach. In the East people have been misunderstood, but because there was an underlying meditative silence and peace and contentment, and a deep understanding that this is just how things are -- they are bound to be misunderstood -- there was a natural acceptance of it. They were not frustrated, they were not angry; they were not going insane or committing suicide. But in the West it has been almost always the situation with every great philosopher -- the misunderstanding from all corners, from all dimensions, and the deep expectation of the person of being understood. He is not a meditator; he cannot accept the situation of misunderstanding, that it is natural, that he cannot do anything about it, that he will be understood when the time is ripe.

He will not be here.... But it does not matter whether he is understood or not: he is perfectly contented that whatever is true to him he is giving to the world. Now it is up to the world when to understand, or not to understand it. He is not dependent in any way on the response of people.

But Western philosophy, Western religion both have missed the quality of meditation. And that creates a new thing. When a man like Nietzsche goes mad, the enemies, who are all around -- the people who misunderstood him and drove him mad -- take advantage of the situation of his being mad. They start saying that it is his philosophy which is basically wrong, that has driven him mad.

His madness becomes a proof that he is a wrong man -- that he is not only mad today, he has always been mad. Whatever he has said is insane. So it becomes a more solid

ground on which to refute the person completely, to erase him completely -- and that's what happened with Nietzsche. But a revival was certain. You cannot continue to misunderstand something which has even a little bit of truth in it -- and Nietzsche has tremendous insights. If they can all be understood, it will help the Western mind to change many things.

For example, Nietzsche was the only one -- even in his madness he would not sign his name without writing over his signature "Antichrist." Even in his madness that much was absolutely certain to him: that he was anti-Christ, that Christ has created a tradition which is immensely dangerous to humanity, that he has polluted the human mind, even about small things.

Where Christ had always been praised, people were surprised that Nietzsche would find a very solid criticism. For example, when Christ says, "If somebody slaps you on one cheek, give him the other too," Nietzsche was the first man to say that this is an insult to the man who has slapped you.

Now, it needs a certain intelligence to understand what he is saying. He is saying, in giving him the other cheek you are reducing him to subhumanity; you are becoming a god. Behave like a human being: give him a good slap the way he has given you one.

And the argument that looked very strange to the Christians who were his contemporaries, was very simple: "In this way you are proving equality. `I am also a human being. If you hit me, then I will hit you. I am not a god, I cannot forgive you.' All those who have been trying to forgive are very subtle egoists. They are enjoying reducing the other

person almost to an animal. That is worse than hitting the man back hard! Just behave like man to man."

And you can watch it: the person who gives his other cheek -- you can see in his eyes and in his face and in his words great pride and great ego. Even when Jesus himself on the cross asks, "Father, forgive these people, because they do not understand what they are doing," he is still trying to prove on the cross the same thing for which he is being crucified -- that everybody is ignorant and only he knows. Again, it was the insight of Nietzsche to see that Jesus' emphasis is not on forgiveness, his emphasis is, "They do not know what they are doing. They do not know whom they are crucifying. They do not understand that they are crucifying the only begotten son of God." In simple words, "These are idiots. Just forgive them -- they are not worth punishment."

Even on the cross his ego is as assertive as it has ever been. He is not a humble man. Although he teaches humility, he never shows humility in his whole life. Then certainly his teaching of humility is just the teaching for making your ego so subtle that it can use humility as food, as nourishment. He is certainly not a humble man. There is no indication in his whole life of where he has acted in a humble manner.

All his declarations that he is the messiah for whom you have been waiting for centuries, that now God has sent his own son to fulfill the promise.... These are not the words of humility, these are not the words of a person who is nobody.

Jesus is not nobody -- he is higher than everybody else. Even the prophets, Moses or Abraham or Elijah, are

nothing; they are only prophets, just messengers. He is the only begotten son of God, and he says clearly that he was even before Abraham.

Now, Abraham was alive almost three thousand years before Jesus; and Jesus is saying he was before Abraham. He is trying to say that he belongs to eternity, he is eternal, and all these prophets are just bubbles in time. He has always been and will always be -- but prophets come and go.

Nietzsche is the only man in the whole Western history who has a deep psychological understanding of Jesus Christ, and who has a very subtle analysis -- far more subtle than any Freud or Jung can do. He has almost all the insights. He could have founded psychoanalysis. He could have founded communism. He could have founded anarchism.

He is really vast, and in all dimensions he goes to the very roots. But people have understood one thing for thousands of years, and then suddenly there is a totally opposite interpretation. Rather than accepting the interpretation, they would prefer to reject the man. And he was rejected by the society in every possible way. He lived almost always lonely.

His writing is also very prophetic, even the method. He does not write in the ordinary way philosophers have been writing down the ages, his writing is aphoristic. You can make a whole philosophy out of one paragraph, it is so condensed. And the man had so much to say that he could not manage to elaborate it himself, so he has just put it in the most condensed form. Just the method of his expression was making him a laughingstock in the eyes of other

philosophers who were trained to write in a certain logical manner, giving every proof and every argument.

But Nietzsche has to say so much that he cannot go into details of the arguments and procedures of how he has arrived -- he simply writes the conclusion, and that conclusion is aphoristic. He then moves to another subject; and he goes on moving that way.

But I love the way he writes. That should be ultimately the way of writing. If people are intelligent you need not go through all the arguments before you give the conclusion; just the conclusion should be enough. If they are sharp and intelligent they will immediately get all the preceding arguments that are not given to them; there is no need....

He was not writing for children, he thought he was writing for philosophers. But he misunderstood: those philosophers were also not mature enough. They wanted the whole procedure. They could not immediately see the whole procedure in the conclusion; and he had to say so much that it was impossible for him to go into the whole procedure. In every direction and dimension he was touching the foundations.

But whatever he has said is just in seed form. So it is natural that it took almost a hundred years... and now people can reconsider this man.

People who are understood by their contemporaries are not geniuses, they are not great giants of intelligence. That's why their contemporaries can understand them.

This revival of interest in Nietzsche will bring many fruits of great importance.

We have seen that he was misunderstood even by the people who thought they were followers of Nietzsche. For

example, Adolf Hitler -- he thought that he was a follower of Nietzsche.

Adolf Hitler is just a retarded man, and the distance between him and Nietzsche's intelligence is so vast; he could not even understand what Nietzsche was saying. So he picked at things which he wanted, just to have a philosopher behind him. And because Adolf Hitler picked him up, Nietzsche became even more condemned along with Adolf Hitler.

It was not his fault -- he had not chosen Adolf Hitler as his successor -- but he became more condemned. Even to mention his name became notorious. He became so closely associated with fascism that even great thinkers would not talk about him, for the simple reason that he was a fascist. He is not a fascist. But when a person is so rich in giving ideas to the world, you can always choose from him things that suit you, and leave everything else that does not suit you.

But one thing has to be remembered: he was misunderstood, and all the people who have been misunderstood have one thing in common -- that nobody refutes them. It is as if misunderstanding is enough. Nobody has refuted Friedrich Nietzsche. Although he has challenged the whole of Christianity, the popes have been silent -- because what he is saying is so clear that it is better to ignore rather than to refute it; you cannot refute it.

It is good -- it will help Europe to get rid of Christianity, which has been a calamity and has kept people retarded. It will also help people to think more aphoristically -- which looks like the person is jumping from one conclusion to another conclusion. That's how every great philosophical

treatise should be written, because it is not written for children, it is not written for schools; it is written for the most highly intelligent people in the world. Its manner also should do them justice.

I have a tremendous love for Friedrich Nietzsche, and a deep compassion, because the man suffered his whole life for the simple reason that he remained a thinker and he never went beyond thoughts; otherwise there would be no question of suffering.

I am more misunderstood than Nietzsche, but it does not make me frustrated, it does not give me any trouble, it cannot drive me insane. I feel great compassion too, that it was a misfortune he was in the West.

He should have been in the East, because in the East it is very difficult to avoid meditation. Sooner or later you are bound to stumble upon it, and particularly a great thinker like Nietzsche. If he had meditated too, he would have been in the same state as Gautam the Buddha -- not less than that. As far as intelligence is concerned, perhaps he is more intelligent than Gautam the Buddha.

If he had just had the meditative quality also, he would have given many more treasures to the world, and he would not have suffered through it. And he would not have given the chance to the people to say that whatever he has written is all insane. His madness became a proof for them that he was insane from the very beginning; it was just growing and growing and growing, and finally it exploded.

From Friedrich Nietzsche much has to be learned.

What I would like the people who are interested in Nietzsche to understand, is that they should not miss meditation the way Nietzsche missed it; otherwise they will

become great intellectuals, but empty within, with no roots, with no great solidity.

And the danger of madness is always there, because the mind's full growth can only lead to madness -- there is no other way. If the mind is developed fully, the person is going to be mad, unless, side by side, he is also developing no-mind, and no-mind becomes his base. Then he can use the mind as much as he wants; it leaves no trace behind.

So this is my message to the lovers of Nietzsche: they should not become just intellectuals.

Nietzsche can only make them intellectuals. And then they will fall into the same ditch in which Nietzsche fell -- the ditch of too much intellectuality creating such a state that it is bound to drive you insane. And these people who are interested in Nietzsche are not of the caliber of Nietzsche either. So not only will they go mad sooner; their madness may lead them to suicide.

This is the mind's natural process.

It is good that people have mediocre minds: mediocre minds cannot go mad. They do all kinds of stupid things in the world, but they don't go mad; a mediocre mind has not the capacity to go mad. But a mediocre mind cannot be interested in Nietzsche, so the people who are interested are getting into a dangerous zone. If they are well-prepared, they will be enriched by Nietzsche's insights. But the preparation is very vital, very essential. Nietzsche alone will drive these sympathizers to madness, to suicide.

Before Nietzsche, they need a good centering in meditation; then Nietzsche can be a great joy. His every

insight can give you immense clarity about things which are always clouded.
The traditionalists don't want the clouds to be removed, because those clouds are helping them -- so they can go on telling people whatever they want to, and they can go on exploiting people and enslaving people.
Nietzsche can be a great freedom.
But without meditation, a great danger.

Question 2
BELOVED OSHO,
MANY SMALL GROUPS OF SANNYASINS ARE FORMING AROUND THE WORLD. WOULD YOU COMMENT ON GURDJIEFF'S WORDS, THAT PEOPLE WHO WANT TO WAKE UP, AND WHO ARE LIVING TOGETHER IN A GROUP, CAN FUNCTION AS ALARM CLOCKS FOR EACH OTHER?

George Gurdjieff is right, but right only about his own system. It is true: if you are following Gurdjieff's ideology and his methods, then a group is an absolute necessity; you cannot work alone.
Then people can function as alarm clocks to each other. If somebody starts falling asleep, somebody can shake him up. When you are starting to fall asleep, somebody else can shake you up and wake you.
Gurdjieff's method is a school method. He himself was trained in different schools of the Sufis. They are all school methods. School methods have a difficulty -- that you have to depend on the group, that if the group is not the right group they can function in just the opposite way: rather

than being alarm clocks, they can all become drugs for each other. You may have watched it: if one person starts falling asleep, immediately something in you also starts falling asleep.

Sleep is contagious.

Awakening is not.

It is possible that twenty people may remain asleep and one person awake, but his awakening is not going to be contagious. Most probably, seeing twenty people asleep he will himself fall asleep. So unless you have a very awakened master, the group method is not going to help much.

But in Gurdjieff's system the group is absolutely necessary; alone you cannot do it. For example, he had his school near Paris.... He told one of the new disciples to dig a trench. The whole day, from the morning -- from sunrise to sunset -- he was not allowed to go to eat or leave for anything; he had to dig the trench. That was the most important thing. Now, it needs somebody to watch; otherwise the man may rest sometimes. The whole day is a long time, a hot day... he may go to have a drink or to eat something; or under the tree there is such beautiful shade and coolness... he may fall asleep.

Gurdjieff himself walked continuously the whole day, just by the side of the man. Now, when Gurdjieff himself was walking by his side continuously, the whole day, of course the man could not leave. By sunset he had made the big trench. And Gurdjieff said, "This is only half the work: now you fill it, and then you can go and sleep."

This was too much. Through great effort the whole day, against all temptations to leave it, he managed, because of

Gurdjieff's presence, to continue, knowing one thing, that it could not kill him: "I cannot die by just not eating for one day or not drinking water. I cannot die -- that much is certain. So let us try."

Now Gurdjieff says, "It is only half the work -- you have now to fill it completely, as it was before you started digging. Then you can go and do whatsoever you want."

And Gurdjieff remained there. It took a few hours for the man again to fill the trench -- by midnight he was freed. That new disciple remembers that that night was the most precious in his life; and only after that night could he understand Gurdjieff's methods.

Man's energy has layers. The first layer is for day-to-day work. It is soon exhausted, and you start feeling tired. If you don't listen to this tiredness, and you continue, then the second layer of energy -- which is an emergency reservoir of energy -- starts functioning. Suddenly you will feel an onrush of new energy becoming available to you, which refreshes you continuously. You cannot believe what has happened: all tiredness is gone. You are more fresh than you were before you started the work.

But the emergency reservoir also is not very big; it is only for emergency situations which don't last for long. So for one hour or two hours you will be full of energy, more than ever; then again the tiredness comes -- and this is a greater tiredness than the first one.

If you don't listen to this tiredness... it is really difficult not to listen to it, almost impossible. But if you manage not to listen -- and that's what Gurdjieff wants, that you continue -- then you touch the third layer, which is vast, which is universal. And once that layer becomes available to you,

you are a new man. Just within a day Gurdjieff could take you to the emergence of the basic power, of the basic energy, the universal energy in you.

But for this kind of method you need a group. If twelve persons are working, then everyone is watching you. Then each person is watched by eleven persons; you cannot escape easily. Alone, it is impossible; you will stop after your day-to-day energy is finished, and you will feel immensely tired, hungry.... That will be the stoppage because there is nobody who can prevent you or whose presence can prevent you; nobody is watching you. So for Gurdjieff's methods it is perfectly true that groups are needed.

My method can be used in a group, but the group is not necessary; you can use it alone. Any group can become a dependence -- so that you can work only in the group. Out of the group, you are back to your usual self. When you are in the group you are a certain person; when you leave the group you are a different person.

I don't want my sannyasins to be dependent.

It is perfectly good to have small groups, but the methods I have given to you are individual; you can work alone. You don't need anybody to watch you, because my method is that you have to be the watcher.

Under somebody's watching eye, out of fear of somebody -- and of course when Gurdjieff himself is watching you, you cannot escape -- but it is something like slavery. Although he is taking you towards deeper layers of your energy, there is some kind of violence, some kind of enforcement, enslavement.

It is possible for you to do almost the impossible in such a situation. But once Gurdjieff is not there, you will become an ordinary person as you have been before. That has happened to almost all his disciples. Even though they have small groups, they are all mediocre, the same.
Rather than helping each other to be awake, they help each other to fall asleep. When one starts snoring, rather than being an alarm clock, he helps you to snore too.
It can function both ways. The group can be a space where you can become more alert; it can be a space where you can become more asleep. And because people started becoming more asleep in Gurdjieff's groups after Gurdjieff's death, those groups have disappeared. People have moved alone. But alone you cannot do those methods.
This is a very spiritual kind of slavery.
The master cannot guarantee to be with you forever; sometime he will be leaving. Then you should not be left in a space where you cannot function without him. And for that, a preparation is needed: from the very beginning you work alone. Even if you are working in a group, you are not dependent on the group; your work, your method, is basically individual.
So my approach is individual.
I am not giving you school methods:
I am giving you individual methods, which can be done together with friends, which can be done alone. So you have freedom.
But there is nothing wrong if sannyasins are making small groups, because those small groups cannot hinder the methods that I have given to you or the work that you have

to do upon yourself. It is available in both situations -- alone or in groups.

But Gurdjieff had no idea -- because he was trained always in schools. Sufis don't have individual methods; all the methods are group methods. He was trained by Sufis, and he went from one school to another; he learned much from those schools, and he developed and polished many methods which had become old and were not contemporary.

But he could not help many people, for the simple reason that he was the only person who was really awake. All the persons were working under him, under pressure -- not out of freedom and joy -- working with the motivation that someday they will become awakened like Gurdjieff.

He was certainly a very strange and powerful man. When he was dying, he got up from his bed and started walking in the corridor. His disciples said, "What are you doing? You are so sick -- it is better to rest."

He said, "It is not sickness, it is death -- and I don't want death to find me a weak person. I want to meet death not lying on the bed, but walking on the verandah."

He died walking. To the last moment he was still working. And he was certainly very awake because he could see death, he could see it was very imminent. But he was a very proud man -- he did not like to die like every ordinary man, in the bed, he wanted to die in his own way.

Whenever he was sick, he would go driving, and he would drive as fast as the car could manage. And everybody in the car was just freaking out, afraid that, "Now there is going to be an accident; now it is going to be..." because he never

cared about any rules, the lights on the crossroads or anything. He would just drive in a mad way.

Just ten years before he died, he had a very great crash. To avoid a truck, he crashed against a rock by the side of the road. He had so many fractures that it was an impossibility... doctors could not believe that a man with so many fractures could walk home. He came out of the car and walked miles with so many fractures. The doctors could not believe that a man could move even a few feet -- and within fifteen days all those fractures were settled. He had immense power.

All his methods are to bring you to the basic source of power. If that basic source of power becomes available to you continuously, it will transform your whole being. But it was not continuously available even to him.

One of his disciples, Bennett, after the second world war, went to him very tired. He was coming from the war, utterly tired, almost ready to die, willing to die.

Gurdjieff was very old, and it was just five years before he died. He asked Bennett to come close to him, and he took hold of both his hands. Bennett remembers in his biography that it was almost as if Gurdjieff was charging a battery from an electric source.

"I could feel the energy rushing through me, but I also could see that Gurdjieff was becoming pale. I was feeling full of energy, all my tiredness gone, as if I had never been to the war. And there was a great desire to live and a great desire to achieve the ultimate -- within seconds. And then Gurdjieff staggered, pale, as if he was going to fall, and went into the bathroom. After ten minutes he came back. He was okay. He was back to his usual health."

Bennett asked him, "What happened? You have given so much to me."
Gurdjieff said, "I can give you energy, but I am not yet continuously in touch with the original source, so I gave my own energy to you. And then I had to do a certain exercise in the bathroom to get in touch with the original source; otherwise you can live -- I will die!"
This is a totally different path than what I am teaching to you. It is a path of power.
What I am teaching to you is the path of awareness.
... Because the path of power has great dangers in it. It can crystallize your ego. It can make you feel very egoistic because you have so much power -- you can do this, you can do that. And that is a danger.
To avoid the ego even in ordinary life is so difficult. If you get in touch with extraordinary sources of power, it will become more and more difficult to get rid of the ego, because the ego will take possession of all your powers.
My work is totally different: you have to be aware. And awareness is not a power. You have to be aware even of your powers. If you come across them, you have to be aware, and you have to remain detached, only a watcher.
That's where Gurdjieff and I use different words. His methods can be described as "self-remembering." That's what he uses -- the word "self-remembering." I do not want to use that word. It is dangerous because the self can be just the ego -- it is playing with fire. I simply use the word "witnessing," with no place for self, ego, or even a faraway cousin.
Just to avoid the most probable possibility, you have just to be a witness. It may not lead you to power -- there is no

need -- but it will lead you to understanding. That is what is needed.
Gurdjieff's disciples became power-oriented and forgot completely about just being watchful. But he was not telling them to be just watchful. There is a possibility of somebody becoming enlightened through his path also, but it goes in a very zigzag way, with more possibility of being lost than of reaching.
What I have been telling you is something which cannot be misused in any way by you.
And witnessing is a purely individual phenomenon.

Question 3
BELOVED OSHO,
YOU HAVE SAID THAT YOU ARE THE BEGINNING, THAT THE BEGINNING IS MYSTERIOUS, AND THAT IT MAY TAKE THOUSANDS OF YEARS TO PROVE WHAT HAS BEEN BORN.
PLEASE TALK TO US ABOUT THE POSSIBILITIES OF HUMANITY AT THIS CLOSING OF AN OLD CYCLE AND THE BEGINNING OF A NEW.

The beginning is naturally mysterious because you can only see a seed changing into a sprout, but you cannot see what is going to happen later on -- that the sprout is going to become a big tree with great foliage, thousands of flowers, fruits. That is still in the future.
You can only remember later on that the beginning was just two small leaves, a sprout, and now you see a big, huge tree. There are trees which can live five thousand years, but

in the beginning you cannot see all those possibilities. It is always retrospectively that things are understood.
The old man has a few characteristics which will be disappearing from the New Man.
The old man was attached to the crowd, different kinds of crowds -- religious crowds, political crowds -- and he wanted to be attached to more crowds. He created Rotary Clubs, Lion's Clubs, just to be part of as many crowds as possible, because alone he was nothing. The more crowds he belonged to, the more he felt he was.
Belonging to crowds was one of the basic characteristics of the old man. The New Man will have just the opposite characteristic: he will be alone.
He will not like to belong to crowds -- the family, the society, the church, the state, the nation, the race. He will hate to belong to any crowd; he will like to be just himself, alone. Because he will have a being, he need not collect a false being from crowds.
The old man was always past-oriented. His heroes were always of the past: his saints were always of the past, his holy books were always of the past -- the more ancient, the more valuable. The old man lived through the dead.
The New Man will not look backwards; he will look forwards, he will be able to encounter the vast emptiness of the future.
The old man was very afraid to look forwards because there is simply emptiness, nothingness; everything is in the past. The old man was very historically-minded.
The New Man will be more courageous to look into the future, to face nothingness, because there is no fear in facing nothingness. If you have a certain centering, a

certain grounding of your being, you can encounter nothingness blissfully, peacefully. He will live in the present -- because you cannot live in the past, you cannot live in the future; you can only live in the present.

The past man, the old man, has not lived at all. He was only making gestures of living, but he never lived, because his mind was never in the present.

The New Man will be more grounded in the present, unconcerned with the past, more open to the future, to the adventure of the new. His whole ecstasy will be to discover the new, not to go on repeating the old... to be discovering something new each moment, creating something new, being something new.

So the New Man will always be an opening, always an adventure. And because he will not be concerned with the old, all the discriminations of the past will be dropped from his mind -- Hindu or Christian, black or white, man or woman. There will not be any evaluation that somebody is higher and somebody is lower. He will be more human than the old man has been.

The old man was more animal, less human. The New Man will be more human, less animal, and the best of the New Man will have lost all animality in them. That means their life will be full of trust, full of love, full of compassion, full of gratitude, and a thousand and one qualities which the old man has been preaching but not practicing.

The New Man will not be preaching these qualities, he will be practicing them. They will be simply his life.

The old man has lived with all kinds of divisions -- nations, races, religions. The New Man will live an undivided

humanity, with all the sources pooled into one. And that will enable him to explore the universe.

We have the capacity, but our whole energy is being wasted in fighting amongst ourselves on this small planet, earth. We have not explored this vast universe that surrounds us, which is such a challenge. And exploring it, the New Man is going to realize things which the old man could not even imagine.

For example, if the whole earth is one, there is no question of wars. And if all the energy that has always been wasted in wars is available for some creative purposes -- and it is immense energy... with that energy man can explore the whole universe.

There is a possibility.... The scientists guess that at least fifty thousand planets have life. Now, what kind of dead and dull men have lived on this earth up to now, that they have not been able to make any contact with other living beings in the universe? It is our universe, but we have not even called this earth ours... just small fragments. And so much is waiting to be revealed that once the new man starts exploring....

For example, if we can move with the speed of light... and I certainly think that there is a possibility. If light can move with a certain speed, why can't means and methods be found so that man can move with the same speed as light? That is the ultimate speed.

The greatest geniuses have been thinking that if man can move with that speed, then he will not become old. He can go searching, exploring in other solar systems, on other planets for a hundred or two hundred or three hundred years, and then can come back. All his contemporaries on

the earth will be dead, their grandchildren will be almost near to death. But the adventurers who had gone on the journey will be just the same age as when they had left the earth. At that speed of light, aging does not happen.
Now, great adventures are there. It is not only that we have this earth, that we have explored it all and we are feeling bored, that there is nothing to explore, that there is no America for Columbus. This whole universe is there for millions of Columbuses. For millions of years we are not going to reach the boundary, because there is no boundary. And one never knows -- whatever scientific researchers have known is just a small fragment of the whole universe; they don't have the whole idea of the universe.

The New Man will be finding new ways in every dimension. The old man was always traditional, clinging to the trodden path. Now there are already thousands of inventions which are not being used because of the old man... because the old man is not ready to use anything new. While the old thing is working well, why bother? Why get into dangerous things?
For example, in Japan, it is now fully proved by experiments that at a certain speed, trains rise above the earth 0.4 inches. So they don't need rails -- just in the beginning, at the start, before they take off. And they can go up to four hundred miles an hour very easily. That is the minimum, four hundred -- we don't know the maximum. And if trains can move above the earth, it will be a totally different experience. It will be really comfortable, far cheaper, and so fast.

The trains are ready, but the old man is not willing to use them. It seems dangerous -- four hundred miles per hour. It is the same danger.... When the first railway trains were introduced... the first day on the London station nobody was ready to sit in the trains. They were invited free, meals were given, but nobody was going to sit in them. And it was only an eight-mile journey, but nobody was ready to sit in the trains because the churches were saying that God never made trains, so it must be the work of the devil.
This has been the way of the old man.
If we can have contact with living beings, perhaps we may come across beings who have more senses than we have... because why should five senses be the limit? We cannot conceive -- beyond the five senses -- what will be the sixth sense?
We cannot conceive beyond taste, smell, sight, hearing, touch. What could be the sixth or the seventh or the eighth or the tenth? Who knows? -- because if we had four senses, we would not have been able to think of the fifth. And on every planet life must have grown differently because the climate is different, the situation is different.
There is so much to explore and to learn and to make available to humanity, that the New Man will be basically adventurous in all dimensions. In medicine, in biology, in space travel, in meditations -- in every possible dimension the New Man will be an adventurer.
He will be very willing to go into it. He will be ready to risk all for the new. And then a vast world of experiences becomes available.
We are living on a small planet, fighting with each other, quarreling over small things, while the whole universe

waits to be discovered. And it may change everything on the earth. It may be that these explorations of the universe, of other planets, will finally help life to survive, because there is a possibility that by the end of this century the earth will change its axis.

Now that will bring tremendous changes -- in the climate, in everything on the earth. If just the Himalayan snow starts melting, then all our great cities, which are ports, will be drowned. Just the Himalayan snow is enough to raise our seas forty feet higher, if it melts. It has never melted, it is eternally there -- but the change of the earth's axis can bring it closer to the sun: it can start melting. Then New York and Bombay and Calcutta and Tokyo and San Francisco -- all the big cities which are near the ocean will be simply drowned.

Scientists are worried that the sun may be burning itself out. It has been giving light for millions of years, its fuel may be finishing. We may not know exactly when, but they don't think it can last forever. A few million years is their estimate. But if the sun does not rise one morning, then everything dies as it is.

It will be necessary that we have other planets available for people to be moved to. If any danger to the earth arises, if there is any danger to the sun, then there is no need to be in this solar system. The whole humanity can be moved to other planets. There is no need for this whole evolution up to man to go down into the water or to die out simply because the sun's fuel is finished.

The old man has nothing to give to humanity in such emergencies.

The New Man will be capable.

Light on the Path

Chapter #30

Chapter title: Utopia is possible

4 February 1986 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1

BELOVED OSHO,

SINCE MY CHILDHOOD, MY MOST INTENSE YEARNING WAS TO HAVE A FRIEND. I HAD TO WAIT FOR THIRTY YEARS TO HAVE THIS YEARNING FULFILLED; AND THEN EVERYTHING I WANTED, HAPPENED. NOW, SINCE YOU HAVE OFFERED US THE GIFT OF BEING A FRIEND, I OFTEN ALLOW MYSELF TO FEEL AND LOVE YOU IN A SIMILAR WAY AS I FEEL AND LOVE THIS FRIEND. IS IT REALLY OKAY?

It is...!

Question 2

BELOVED OSHO,

THE LONGING FOR A BETTER LIFE, FOR A UTOPIA, HAS BEEN CONSTANTLY IN MAN'S MIND SINCE HE BECAME AWARE OF HIS CONSCIOUSNESS. ON THE OTHER HAND HE BECAME MORE AND MORE AFRAID OF ALL HIS IRRATIONAL POWERS. CAN YOU PLEASE COMMENT?

The yearning for a utopia is basically the yearning for harmony in the individual and in the society. The harmony has never existed; there has always been a chaos.
Society has been divided into different cultures, different religions, different nations -- and all based on superstitions. None of the divisions are valid.
But these divisions show that man is divided within himself: these are the projections of his own inner conflict. He is not one within, that's why he could not create one society, one humanity outside.
The cause is not outside. The outside is only the reflection of the inner man.
Man has developed from the animals. Even if Charles Darwin is not right... His theory of evolution -- that man has developed out of the apes -- does look a little childish, because for thousands of years these apes have been there, but none of them have developed into human beings. So it is strange that only a few apes developed into human beings, and the remaining ones still are apes; and there seems to be no sign that they are going to change into human beings.
Secondly, he could not find a link between man and the ape, because whenever things develop there are always steps, not jumps. The ape cannot simply jump and become a human being. There must be a process of evolution; there must be a few in between stages, and those stages are missing. Charles Darwin worked his whole life to find the missing link, but he could not find anything.
But according to Eastern mysticism, in a very different way, man is evolved from the animals -- not as far as his body is concerned, but as far as his being is concerned. And

that seems to be more relevant. Charles Darwin has almost lost his ground in scientific fields. Now the anti-Darwinians are winning, and Charles Darwin is almost out of date. It was only a fiction.

But Eastern mysticism has the same theory -- not that the ape's body develops into a human body, but that an ape's soul or an elephant's soul, or a lion's soul, can develop into a human being. First the soul develops, and then, according to the soul's need, nature provides the body. So there is no bodily evolution, but there is a spiritual connection.

This is profoundly supported by modern psychoanalysis, particularly Carl Gustav Jung's school, because in the collective unconscious of man there are memories which belong to animalhood.

If man is taken deep into hypnosis, first he enters the unconscious mind, which is just the repressed part of this life. If he is hypnotized even more deeply, then he enters into the collective unconscious, which has memories of being animals.

People start screaming -- in that stage they cannot speak a language. They start moaning or crying, but language is impossible; they can shout, but in an animal way. And in the collective unconscious state, if they are allowed to move or they are told to move, they move on all fours -- they don't stand up.

In the collective unconscious there are certainly remnants that suggest that they have been sometime in some animal body. And different people come from different animal bodies. That may be the cause of such a difference in individuals. And sometimes you can see a similarity --

somebody behaves like a dog, somebody behaves like a fox, somebody behaves like a lion.

And there is great support in folklore, in ancient parables like AESOP'S FABLES, or PANCHTANTRA in India -- which is the most ancient -- in which all the stories are about animals, but are very significant for human beings and represent certain human types.

Charles Darwin may have failed because he was only looking for a link between bodies, physical bodies; and there may not be any link between physical bodies. But Eastern mysticism may be right that man has evolved spiritually from animalhood.

Man still carries much of the animal's instinct -- his anger, his hatred, his jealousy, his possessiveness, his cunningness. All that has been condemned in man seems to belong to a very deep-rooted unconscious. And the whole work of spiritual alchemy is how to get rid of the animal past.

Without getting rid of the animal past, man will remain divided. The animal past and his humanity cannot exist as one, because humanity has just the opposite qualities. So all that man can do is become a hypocrite.

As far as formal behavior is concerned, he follows the ideals of humanity -- of love and of truth, of freedom, of non-possessiveness, compassion. But it remains only a very thin layer, and at any moment the hidden animal can come up; any accident can bring it up. And whether it comes up or not, the inner consciousness is divided.

This divided consciousness has been creating the yearning and the question: How to become a harmonious whole as far as the individual is concerned? And the same is true

about the whole society: How can we make the society a harmonious whole -- where there is no war, no conflict, no classes; no divisions of color, caste, religion, nation? Because of people like Thomas Moore, who wrote the book UTOPIA, the name became synonymous with all idealistic goals -- but they have not grasped the real problem. That's why it seems their idea of a utopia is never going to happen. If you think of society as becoming an ideal society, a paradise, it seems to be impossible: There are so many conflicts, and there seems to be no way to harmonize them.

Every religion wants to conquer the whole world, not to be harmonized.

Every nation wants to conquer the whole world, not to be harmonized.

Every culture wants to spread all over the world and to destroy all other cultures, not to bring a harmony between them.

So utopia became synonymous with something which is simply imaginary. And there are dreamers -- the very word "utopia" also means "that which is never going to happen." But still man goes on thinking in those terms again and again. There seems to be some deep-rooted urge.... But his thinking is about the symptoms -- that's why it seems to be never going to happen. He is not looking at the causes. The causes are individuals.

Utopia is possible. A harmonious human society is possible, should be possible, because it will be the best opportunity for everyone to grow, the best opportunity for everyone to be himself. The richest possibilities will be available to everyone.

So it seems that the way it is, society is absolutely stupid. The utopians are not dreamers, but your so-called realists who condemn utopians are stupid. But both are agreed on one point -- that something has to be done in the society. Prince Kropotkin, Bakunin, and their followers, would like all the governments to be dissolved -- as if it is in their hands, as if you simply say so and the governments will dissolve. These are the anarchists, who are the best utopians. Reading them, it seems that whatever they are saying is significant. But they have no means to materialize it, and they have no idea how it is going to happen.

And there is Karl Marx, Engels, and Lenin -- the Marxists, the communists, and different schools of socialism, connected with different dreamers. Even George Bernard Shaw had his own idea of socialism, and he had a small group called the Fabian Society. He was propagating a kind of socialist world, totally different from the communist world that exists today.

There are fascists who think that it is a question of more control and more government power; just the opposite pole of anarchists, who want no government -- all the source of corruption is government. And there are people, the fascists, who want all power in the hands of dictators.

It is because of the democratic idea that the society is falling apart, because in democracy the lowest denominator becomes the ruler. He decides who is going to rule; and he is the most ignorant one, he has no understanding. The mob decides how the society should be. So according to the fascist, democracy is only mobocracy, it is not democracy -- there is no democracy possible.

According to the communists, the whole problem is simply the class division between the poor and the rich. They think that if all government power goes into the hands of the poor, and they have a dictatorship of the proletariat -- when all classes have disappeared, and the society has become equal -- then soon there will be no need of any state.
They are all concerned with the society. And that is where their failure lies. As I see it, utopia is not something that is not going to happen, it is something that is possible, but we should go to the causes, not to the symptoms. And the causes are in the individuals, not in the society.
For example, seventy years have passed in Soviet Russia, and the communist revolution has not yet been able to dissolve the dictatorship. Lenin was thinking that ten or fifteen years at the most would be enough, because by that time we would have equalized everybody, distributed wealth equally -- then there would be no need for a government.
But after fifteen years they found that the moment you remove the enforced state, people are going to become again unequal. There will be again rich people and there will be again poor people, because there is something in people which makes them rich or poor. So you have to keep them in almost a concentration camp if you want them to remain equal. But this is a strange kind of equality because it destroys all freedom, all individuality.
And the basic idea was that the individual will be given equal opportunity. His needs should be fulfilled equally. He will have everything equal to everybody else. He will share it.

But the ultimate outcome is just the opposite. They have almost destroyed the individual to whom they were trying to give equality, and freedom, and everything good that should be given to individuals. The very individual is removed. They have become afraid of the individual; and the reason is that they are still not aware that however long the enforced state lasts -- seventy or seven hundred years -- it will not make any difference.

The moment you remove control, there will be a few people who know how to be rich, and there will be a few people who know how to be poor. And they will simply start the whole thing again.

In the beginning they tried... because Karl Marx's idea was that there should be no marriage in communism. And he was very factual about it: that marriage was born because of individual property. His logic was correct. There was a time when there was no marriage. People lived in tribes, and just as animals make love, people made love.

The problem started only when a few people who were more cunning, more clever, more powerful, had managed some property. Now they wanted that their property, after their death, should go to their own children. It is a natural desire that if a person works his whole life and gathers property, land, or creates a kingdom, it should go to his children.

In a subtle way, through the children, because they are his blood, he will be still ruling, he will be still possessing. It is a way to find some substitute for immortality, because the continuity will be there: "I will not be there, but my child will be there -- who will represent me, who will be my blood and my bones and my marrow. And then his child

will be there and there will be a continuity. So in a subtle sense, I will have immortality. I cannot live forever, so this is a substitute way."

That's why marriage was created; otherwise it was easier for man not to have any marriage, because marriage was simply a responsibility -- of children, of a wife. When the woman is pregnant, then you have to feed her.... And there was no need to take all that responsibility. The woman was taking the whole responsibility.

But the man wanted some immortality, and that his property should be possessed by his own blood. And the woman wanted some protection -- she was vulnerable. While she was pregnant, she could not work, she could not go hunting; she had to depend on somebody.

So it was in the interest of both to have a contract that they would remain together, would not betray in any sense, because the whole thing was to keep the blood pure.

So Marx's idea was that when communism comes, and property becomes collective, marriage becomes meaningless because its basic reason is removed -- now you don't have any private property. Your son will not have anything as an inheritance.

In fact, just as you cannot have private property, you cannot have a private woman; that too is property. And you cannot have a private son or daughter, because that too is private property. So with the disappearance of private property, marriage will disappear.

So after the revolution, for two or three years, in Russia they tried it, but it was impossible. Private property had disappeared, but people were not ready to drop marriage. And even the government found that if marriage

disappears, the whole responsibility falls on the government -- of the children, of the woman.... So why take an unnecessary responsibility? -- and it is not a small thing. It is better to let marriage continue.

So they reversed the policy; they forgot all about Karl Marx, because just within three years they found that this was going to create difficulty, and people were not willing. People were not willing to drop private property either -- it was forcibly taken away from them. Almost one million people were killed -- for small private properties. Somebody had a small piece of land, a few acres, and because everything was going to be nationalized.... Although the people were poor, still they wanted to cling to their property. At least they had something; and now even that was going to be taken out of their hands. They were hoping to get something more -- that's why they had had the revolution, and fought for it. Now what they had was going to be taken out of their hands. It was going to become government property, it was going to be nationalized....

And for small things -- somebody may have had just a few hens, or a cow, and he was not willing... because that was all that he had. A small house... and he was not willing for it to be nationalized.

These poor people -- one million people were killed to make the whole country aware that nationalization had to happen. Even if you had only a cow and you didn't give it to the government, you were finished.

And the government was thinking that people would be willing to separate... but this is how the merely theoretical

and logical people have always failed to understand man. They have never looked into his psychology.
This was true, that marriage was created after private property came into being -- marriage followed it. Logically, as private property is dissolved, marriage should disappear. But they don't understand the human mind. As property was taken away, people became even more possessive of each other because nothing was left. Their land has gone, their animals have gone, their houses have gone. Now they don't want to lose their wife or their husband or their children. This is too much.
Logic is one thing... and unless we try to understand man more psychologically and less logically, we are always going to commit mistakes.
Marx was proved wrong.
When everything was taken away people were clinging to each other more, more than before, because now that was their only possession: a woman, a husband, children.... And it was such a gap in their life; their whole property had gone and now their wife was also to be nationalized. They could not conceive the idea because their mind and their tradition said, "That is prostitution." Their children had to be nationalized -- they had not fought the revolution for this.
So finally the government had to reverse the policy; otherwise in their constitution.... In the first constitution they had declared that now there shall be no marriage; and the question of divorce did not arise. Just within three years they had to change it.
And in Russia now marriage is more strict than anywhere else. Divorce is more difficult than anywhere else, because

the government does not want unnecessary changes. That creates paperwork and more bureaucracy. So the government wants people to remain together, not to unnecessarily change partners. And divorce creates law cases about the children -- who should have them, the father or mother; it is unnecessary.

The government thinks of efficiency -- less bureaucracy, less paperwork -- and people are creating unnecessary paperwork, so it is very difficult to get a divorce.

And as time passed, they found that there was no way to keep people equal without force. But what kind of a utopia is it which is kept by force? And because the communist party has all the force, a new kind of division has come into being, a new class of the bureaucrats: those who have power, and those who don't have any power.

It is very difficult to become a member, to obtain membership of the communist party in Russia, because that is entering into the power elite. The communist party has made many other groups -- first you have to be a member of those groups, and you have to be checked in every way. When they find that you are really reliable, absolutely reliable, trustworthy, then you may enter into the communist party. And the party is not increasing its membership because that means dividing power.

The party wants to remain as small as possible so that the power is in a few hands. There is now a powerful class. For seventy years the same group has been ruling the country, and the whole country is powerless.

The people were never so powerless under a capitalist regime or under a feudal regime. Under the czars they were never so powerless. It was possible for a poor man, if he

was intelligent enough, to become rich. Now it is not so easy. You may be intelligent, but it is not so easy to enter from the powerless class into the class which holds power. The distance between the two classes is far more than it was before.

There is always a mobility in a capitalist society, because there are not only poor people and rich people; there is a big middle class, and the middle class is continuously moving. A few people of the middle class are moving into the super-rich, and more people are moving into the poor class. A few poor people are moving into the middle class; a few rich people are falling into the middle class, or may even fall into the poor class... there is mobility.

In a communist society there is an absolutely static state. Classes are now completely cut off from each other.

They were going to create a classless society, and they have created the most strict society with static classes.

It is almost a repetition of Hinduism.

What Manu did five thousand years ago, communists have done in Russia now. Manu made Hindu society into four classes. There is no mobility. You are born a brahmin; that is the only way to be a brahmin. And that is the highest society, the topmost class. Then number two is the warriors, the kings -- the chhatriyas. But you are born in that caste, it is not a question that you can move. Then third is the class of the vaishyas, the business people; you are born in it. And the fourth is the sudras, the untouchables. All are born into their caste. That's why, until Christianity started converting so many Hindus, particularly the sudras, who were ready, very willing to become Christians, because at least they would be touchable.... Amongst

Hindus sudras are untouchable, and there is no way to get out of the structure.

For your whole life you have to remain the same as your forefathers remained for five thousand years. For five thousand years there has been a stratified society. If somebody is a shoemaker, his family has been making shoes for five thousand years. He cannot do any other work, he cannot enter into any other profession. That is not allowed.

Hindus were not a converting religion, because the great question was, if you convert somebody, in what class are you going to put the person? Christianity is a converting religion because it has no classification; you simply become a Christian. If Catholics convert you, you become a Catholic; if Protestants convert you, you become a Protestant.

But in Hinduism you cannot be converted, for the simple reason: Where will you be put? Brahmins won't allow you, and you would not like to be put with the sudras, the untouchables. So then what is the point of coming to a religion where you will not be even touched? Even your shadow will be untouchable. And a brahmin has to take a bath if the shadow of a sudra falls on him. The sudra has not touched him, but his shadow is also untouchable.

Being the ancientmost religion, still Hinduism has not been spreading; it has been shrinking. Buddhism spread all over Asia, and it is only twenty-five centuries old. Hinduism is at least ten thousand years old, or more, but it could not spread, for the simple reason that birth is decisive. You can be a Hindu only by birth, just as you can be a Jew only by

birth -- and these are the two most ancient religions. These are really the two basic religions.

Christianity and Mohammedanism are offshoots of Judaism; and Jainism and Buddhism are offshoots of Hinduism. Jainism and Buddhism are both the rebellion of the second class -- the chhatriyas, the warriors -- because they had the powers. They were the kings, they were the soldiers, they had the power -- and yet the brahmin was on top of them. So naturally, sooner or later they were going to revolt, and finally they did revolt. Gautam Buddha and Mahavira are both from the second class. They wanted to be first class, they had the power, and the brahmins had nothing: Why should they be the highest class? So it was a rebellion.

But it was a strange thing that although these two religions got out of the Hindu fold, only Buddhism could spread all over Asia. Jainism could not spread out of India. Buddhism managed to spread out of India: from India it disappeared, but it took over the whole of Asia. And the reason was that it was through Gautam Buddha's very compassionate mind that he allowed anybody to enter into Buddhism.

Jainas, although they had also rebelled against the brahmins, remained of the same mind -- that they are higher than the other two classes. They wanted to be higher than brahmins too, but they never started converting anybody, because who would they convert? Brahmins will not be ready to be converted -- they are already higher than everybody. Only sudras can be converted because they will be raised on the evaluation scale. But Jainas -- Mahavira and his group -- were not so compassionate as to take them in.

So Jainism is not a complete culture -- it has to depend on Hinduism for everything -- it has remained only a philosophy. No Jaina can make shoes -- some Hindu sudra has to make the shoes. No Jaina can clean the toilets -- some sudra has to do that work.

Although they rebelled against brahmins, their rebellion was just against the superiority of the brahmins, and they wanted themselves to be higher than the brahmins. But they were also not in favor of the lower classes being taken higher.

And the ultimate result was that Jainas have remained a very small religion, confined in numbers. And because they left Hinduism, rather than rising higher than brahmins, they even fell from the second category. Because they left Hinduism, they were no longer chhatriyas. They were no longer considered to be warriors, and they could not be because of their nonviolence. They had to drop the idea of fighting, so the only way was to become business people. Lower you can go -- nobody prevents you -- so they had to go from the second class to the third class, and they all became business people. So the rebellion failed very badly. Jainas wanted to become higher than the first class; the outcome of their revolution was that they went from the second class to the third class.

And they are absolutely dependent on Hindus. For their manual work they need workers -- they cannot work. And because they became business people, slowly, slowly the Hindu vaishyas, the Hindu business people, and the Jaina business people came closer. Even marriages started happening between them.

By and by they even had to ask brahmins to do their worship work -- and they had money to pay for it. So brahmins worshipped for the Jainas -- who are against brahminism, against Hinduism; but they had to use Hindus for everything. Their shoes are made by the sudras; their toilets are cleaned by the sudras. Their properties have to be protected by the chhatriyas, because they cannot take the sword in their hands. They cannot kill, so they cannot fight, they cannot go to war; they have their security force in the warrior race. And finally their priests -- the brahmins came in from the back door as their priests.

Manu tried this immobile society -- which is still the same -- five thousand years ago. That too was a kind of utopia, because he was thinking in terms of there being no class struggle this way.

The class struggle can be dropped in two ways. Either there should be no classes; then there will be no class struggle.... That's what communism is doing, but it has failed because a new class has appeared. The other way is that the classes should be so stratified that there is no question of one person moving into another class. No struggle will be there, so there will be no competition.

The brahmin will remain a brahmin. He will remain on the top; whether he is poor or rich does not matter. The businessman will remain a businessman. Just because he is rich he cannot become a brahmin, he cannot purchase the caste. He cannot rise; he will remain third class, however rich he is. The sudras will remain sudras: they have to do all the dirty work and they cannot move from there.

This was also a utopia. The idea was that if the classes are completely static, there is not going to be any struggle,

competition. In a way Manu succeeded more than Marx, because for five thousand years his idea has remained in practice, and in India the Hindu society has never been in a class struggle.

The poor are there, the rich are there, but that is not the real problem for the Hindu. His real problem is those four classes, which are absolutely static. But that is very dangerous because you prevent people from moving in a direction where they can find their potential fulfilled. A sudra may prove to be a great warrior, but he will never be allowed. A brahmin may prove a great industrialist, but he cannot lower himself.

So it saved the society from class struggle, but it destroyed the individual and his potential completely. The genius was ruined. In just the same way it is happening in communism: the individual is destroyed, his genius is ruined. He cannot move upwards even if he has the capacity.

There have been attempts all over the world to make a harmonious human society, but all have failed for the simple reason that nobody has bothered why it is not naturally harmonious.

It is not harmonious because each individual inside is divided, and his divisions are projected onto the society. And unless we dissolve the individual's inner divisions, there is no possibility of really realizing a utopia and creating a harmonious society in the world.

So the only way for a utopia is that your consciousness should grow more, and your unconsciousness should grow less, so finally a moment comes in your life when there is nothing left which is unconscious: you are simply a pure consciousness. Then there is no division.

And this kind of person, who has just consciousness and nothing opposed to it, can become the very brick in creating a society which has no divisions. In other words, only a society which is enlightened enough can fulfill the demand of being harmonious -- a society of enlightened people, a society of great meditators who have dropped their divisions.

Instead of thinking in terms of revolution and changing the society, its structure, we should think more of meditation and changing the individual. That is the only possible way that some day we can drop all divisions in the society. But first they have to be dropped in the individual -- and they can be dropped there.

It is almost like the fourfold division as Manu conceived the society. You have the conscious, you have the unconscious, you have the collective unconscious, and you have the cosmic unconscious. These are the four divisions within you; as you go deeper you go into darker spaces. Manu also divided society in four. The most conscious part is the brahmin -- he makes up the topmost, the wisest part. But he starts with the society.

When Manu first divided the society, somebody may have been a wise man, but it is not necessary that his sons and daughters will also be wise, that generation after generation the wise man will create only wise people -- that is a stupid idea. So the first division may have been very accurate. He may have sorted out people correctly: the conscious people on the top, then less conscious people, then more unconscious people, then absolutely unconscious people. And if Manu calls absolutely unconscious people "sudras," untouchables, there is nothing wrong in it; philosophically

it is absolutely right. But practically he went wrong because he did not think that it would not always happen that the unconscious people would produce unconscious people.
It happened that all the enlightened people came from the second class -- that is from the warriors -- not from the brahmins, which were the topmost class. It is very strange. Even Hindu incarnations -- Rama and Krishna -- they all belonged to the second class; they were not brahmins. Buddha and Mahavira -- they were not brahmins.
So the brahmin class has not produced a single enlightened person, because they became very self-satisfied. They were on the top -- what more do you need? Everybody was going to touch their feet; even the king had to touch their feet. They were the purest people, so there was no urge to find more; it was enough. It was very satisfying and gratifying to their egos.
Why did it happen to the chhatriyas, the second class? My understanding is, because they were second class, there was an immense urge for them to surpass the brahmins, and the only way they could find to surpass the brahmins was to become enlightened. Then only could they surpass the brahmins; otherwise they could not.
The brahmins are the most learned scholars. The chhatriyas had to attain something which is higher than learning and scholarship. They had to attain something which is not given by birth, so brahmins cannot claim it. Just by birth nobody can claim enlightenment.
And it only happened in the second class because it is part of human psychology that the closer you are to the highest class the more competitiveness is within you. The more distant you are the less hope you have that you can manage

to compete with the brahmin. The businessman cannot think he can manage to compete. The sudra of course cannot even imagine or dream that he can manage anything. He is not allowed even to read; he is not allowed to be educated. He is kept completely enslaved in his unconsciousness, so there is no question of a sudra becoming enlightened.

The businessman has another competition, and that is of money. That is a horizontal competition amongst businessmen. He is trying to compete to have more money, and he knows he cannot compete with the warriors: a businessman is not a soldier. And he cannot compete with the priest because a businessman is not a scholar.

And the brahmins kept a complete hold on all the great ancient scriptures and literature. They were only to give those books to their children, to their descendants. And for thousands of years those books were not printed, although printing started in China three thousand years ago, and it could have come to India without any difficulty. People must have been aware -- they were constantly coming and going to China. If Buddhism could spread all over China, it is impossible that they could not have brought back the mechanism and understanding to print.

But brahmins were against printing. They were even against printing their scriptures when the Britishers came -- three hundred years ago -- and took over India from the Mohammedans. It was against their will that the scriptures were printed, because they were afraid that once they are printed, they become public property. Then anybody can read them, and anybody can become a scholar. They wanted to keep them to themselves, so there were only

handwritten copies which were kept as a family tradition: so each family has its own handwritten copy of certain scriptures. The brahmins monopolized it.

The chhatriyas, the second class, tried -- and that was a great effort -- to become enlightened to surpass the brahmins. But it is very significant to understand that by becoming enlightened they became divisionless, their being became one. And certainly they became higher than any human being who was divided. There was no question about their superiority.

So even brahmins would come to the enlightened people without bothering that they came from the second class. So brahmins have touched the feet of non-brahmins -- which would have been impossible. But once the non-brahmin has become enlightened then the brahmin knows that what he knows is only parrot-like. What this man knows is not parrot-like. He is not a scholar, he is really a knower. So hundreds of brahmins were disciples of Buddha, hundreds of brahmins were disciples of Mahavira.

The world can come to a harmony if meditation is spread far and wide, and people are brought to one consciousness within themselves. This will be a totally different dimension to work with.

Up to now it was revolution. The point was society, its structure. It has failed again and again in different ways. Now it should be the individual; and not revolution, but meditation, transformation.

And it is not so difficult as people think. They may waste six years in getting a master's degree in a university; and they will not think that this is wasting too much time for just a degree which means nothing.

It is only a question of understanding the value of meditation. Then it is easily possible for millions of people to become undivided within themselves. And they will be the first group of humanity to become harmonious. And their harmoniousness, their beauty, their compassion, their love -- all their qualities -- are bound to resound around the world.

My effort is to make meditation almost a science so it is not something to do with religion.

So anybody can practice it -- whether he is a Hindu or a Christian or a Jew or a Mohammedan, it doesn't matter. What his religion is, is irrelevant; he can still meditate. He may not even believe in any religion, he may be an atheist; still he can meditate.

Meditation has to become almost like a wildfire. Then there is some hope.

And people are ready: they have been thirsting for something that changes the whole flavor of the society. It is ugly as it is, it is disgusting. It is at the most, tolerable. Somehow people have been tolerating it. But to tolerate is not a very joyful thing.

It should be ecstatic.

It should be enjoyable.

It should bring a dance to people's hearts.

And once these divisions within a person disappear, he can see so clearly about everything. It is not a question of his being knowledgeable, it is a question of his clarity. He can look at every dimension, every direction with such clearness, with such deep sensitivity, perceptiveness, that he may not be knowledgeable but his clarity will give you answers which knowledge cannot give.

This is one of the most important things -- the idea of utopia -- which has been following man like a shadow for thousands of years. But somehow it got mixed up with the changing of society; the individual never got looked at . Nobody has paid much attention to the individual -- and that is the root cause of all the problems. But because the individual seems to be so small and the society seems so big, people think that we can change society, and then the individuals will change.

This is not going to be so -- because "society" is only a word; there are only individuals, there is no society. The society has no soul -- you cannot change anything in it. You can change only the individual, howsoever small he appears. And once you know the science of how to change the individual, it is applicable to all the individuals everywhere.

And my feeling is that one day we are going to attain a society which will be harmonious, which will be far better than all the ideas that utopians have been producing for thousands of years.

The reality will be far more beautiful.

Question 3

BELOVED OSHO,

I'M NOT SURE WHETHER I'M HAVING SOME MOMENTS OF MEDITATION OR I'M SIMPLY PRODUCING SOMETHING WHICH FEELS VERY PLEASANT INSIDE. DOES IT MATTER IF I DON'T KNOW WHICH IS WHICH, AS LONG AS I JUST KEEP TRYING TO WATCH IT ALL?

No, it does not matter. If it feels pleasant, it does not matter. One need not bother which is which. If it is pleasant just go on producing it.
That is a clear indication of getting closer to meditativeness.
So every moment you can create of pleasantness, sweetness, blissfulness within you, is enough; you need not bother or think about it and waste time asking: "What is it?"... because in thinking you may get lost, lose track, lose the knack that you were using to produce it. So don't waste time in thinking about it.
If it is pleasant, it is good. If it is pleasant, it will end in blissfulness. The pleasantness should be taken as an absolutely certain indication: it is arrowed towards meditation.
So no need to think about it. All that time that you will think about it has to be given to producing it more and more. Just remember that the feeling of pleasantness is not possible if you are not on the right track.

Light on the Path

Chapter #31
Chapter title: The divine is the depth of diving into this moment
5 February 1986 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
YOU ARE THE ETERNAL, AWESOME SILENCE AND GRANDEUR OF THE HIMALAYAS. AND YET YOU

LIVE IN A FRAGILE, HUMAN BODY, WHICH IS SUCH A JOY FOR US TO BE TOGETHER WITH. IN CONNECTION WITH YOU, AND EVEN MORE IN RELATION TO CLOSE FRIENDS, THE QUESTION ARISES: CAN THE PLAYFULNESS OF HUMAN LOVE BE BRIDGED WITH REVERENCE FOR THE DIVINE?

The distinction is very old, but absolutely meaningless -- -- the distinction between playfulness and reverence.
They are not two separate things.
If playfulness goes to its deepest core, there is a reverence arising out of it spontaneously. It is not a contradiction to it. But because all the traditions in the past have made them contradictory, the human mind has become accustomed to thinking in terms of them being two different things, with a gap which is almost unbridgeable.
Playfulness is condemned by the past heritage of man, and respect for the divine is praised. It is the same problem in different words which I have synthesized in Zorba the Buddha.
Zorba is playfulness.
Buddha is reverence.
They have been kept separate for centuries, and that has harmed both. All that is divine became too serious. It lost the human touch. It became stone dead. It is not a coincidence that all the gods finally turned into stone statues. Respect cannot allow them to be alive, give them the guts to be alive -- you may find difficulties in respecting the divine.
To be alive means to have a sense of humor, to have a deep loving quality, to have playfulness.

We have made respect so contrary to life that the people we respect, we almost kill. We don't allow them to be human -- if they are human they lose their respectability. So our saints are almost dead; only then can we give them respect, which we think is divine. But it is not respect for the divine, it is respect for the dead.

I am absolutely against all life-negative attitudes -- and respect for the divine has been life-negative. To make it life-affirmative, playfulness, a sense of humor, love, and respect have all to be joined together.

This is the great alchemy I am working at, which will produce Zorba the Buddha.

It is almost inconceivable in terms of the past.

The ambassador of Ceylon to America wrote a letter to me, saying that we should not call our discos "Zorba the Buddha," because "it is insulting to Buddha."

I replied to him, "It is not insulting, it is bringing life back to the Buddha. You have made him a stone statue -- we want him to be back in a human form, and Zorba is the most beautiful human form. And we don't see that being alive like Zorba -- playful, joyous about the small things of life -- is against Buddha." It is really the foundation of an authentic buddha.

But we have been conditioned to insult life. It seems to be a strategy, so that our whole respect goes to fictitious gods. Life should not receive our respect; it is too mundane, too ordinary. Respect should be kept only for something beyond life. But beyond life there is only death.

The people who love Zorba, the atheists particularly, are also against me, saying that I am joining Buddha with Zorba and destroying Zorba, because they cannot coexist.

Buddha will not allow Zorba's playfulness, his nonseriousness, his music, his dance, his love. Buddha cannot allow them, because Buddha himself cannot dance, cannot love, cannot sing, cannot play on a musical instrument, cannot enjoy anything.

So the atheist association of America wrote to me -- that I am trying to do the impossible. Buddha is going to destroy Zorba, "and we don't want Zorba to be killed." The Buddhists are afraid that Zorba will kill the Buddha; the atheists are afraid that Buddha will kill the Zorba -- because this is how our whole mind is conditioned. And I want to have a breakthrough of all this conditioning, to come out of it and be respectful to life.

Reverence for life is the only respect for the divine, because there is nothing more divine than life itself. Anything other than life is going to be dead, and there is no point in being respectful to the dead. It is dangerous, because your respect is going to kill your own livingness, your own qualities of life. At least it is going to poison them: you will feel a certain condemnation of yourself. If your respect is for the dead, then you cannot be fully alive. So let me make it clear to you: don't call it "respect for the divine." It will be better to call it "reverence for life." And then there is no problem. Then playfulness is part of being alive; it is the overflowing energy of life. It can become a dance, it can become a song, it can become any kind of creativity.

I wrote to both the ambassador of Ceylon to America and the atheist association of America, saying that it looks contradictory because of their conditionings -- and that I want to destroy those conditionings; hence specifically I

have chosen Zorba and Buddha, two polarities, and have put them together. And I want the New Man to live both together, without any contradiction.

Once we stop thinking of respect for the divine and start thinking of respect for life, reverence for life, then the bridge becomes immediately possible. Then playfulness, then livingness, and all that is implied in life -- very small moments of joy -- suddenly take on a spiritual meaning too. Nobody has ever tried to give them any spiritual meaning. In fact, all the religions have joined in the conspiracy to condemn living moments in life and have made ideals which are lifeless. The more a person becomes lifeless, joyless, forgets laughing, forgets everything that life consists of -- this is called the great renunciation -- the more he becomes respectable as a saint.

He is almost in his grave, not in his body.

He has condemned his body.

He has condemned his senses.

Even the fragrance of a flower he has renounced. The beauty of a sunset he has renounced. The joy of being with friends, eating with friends or just chitchatting with friends he has renounced. He has no friends; he has only people who respect him. And there is a great distance between him and the people who respect him -- and the distance is from life.

So the whole past is full of life worshipping death, and life trying to achieve respectability at the cost of losing livingness. This has destroyed all of human nature, its harmony; and it has created a dichotomy between the soul and the body, between this world and that world.

There is only one world: this world.

And when you go deep into it, you find that world hidden in this world. There is no contradiction between this and that. This is the circumference, and that is the center. And to get to that, you have to dive deep into this.
"This" means Zorba.
And "that" means Buddha.
Zorba is the circumference -- Buddha is the center. But no circumference is possible without a center, and no point can be called a center without a circumference. We find no difficulty in geometry, but in life's geometry we have created a contradiction between the center and the circumference.
The mundane life is the circumference. It has to be enjoyed so deeply that you start finding in it the sacred, the divine. The divine is nothing but the depth of diving into this moment, into this world, into this life, into this body.
Perhaps this is the greatest problem that man has to resolve. Without resolving it he can never be healthy, he can never be whole. As a Zorba he is half, just circumference -- unaware of the center, not only unaware but almost denying the center.
And the person who reaches to the center is forced to deny the circumference; otherwise he is not respectable. We tend to ask him, "Then what is the difference between us and you?" No buddha has been courageous enough to say, "The difference is in the depth, the difference is not in activities." You love -- I love. But your love remains superficial, only on the circumference. And my love reaches to the very center.
You taste food -- I taste food. But your taste is superficial. When I taste food, it has a depth.

What I am saying, nobody has dared to say.
Against the whole conditioning of humanity, even the buddhas have not been courageous enough to risk their respectability.
Perhaps I am the first man who has risked all respectability -- because to me respectability is nothing but subtle ego. I would rather be notorious than be divided, than be respected by people who can only respect the dead part, the deadness in a living man.
This has created a kind of schizophrenia, from which the whole humanity is suffering. And because the whole humanity is suffering from the same disease, we tend not to see it.
If one person suffers from a disease, we can immediately pick him out because everybody else is not suffering from it. But when everybody without exception is suffering, then it becomes difficult to call it a disease; it seems to be just part of nature.
Schizophrenia has gone deep into your very blood, bones, marrow. That's why we see a contradiction between the mundane and the divine, between playfulness and respect for the divine. It is a created contradiction, so we don't need to synthesize them. In fact, in reality they are one, but we don't allow them to be one.
If somebody is in deep love with this life, we condemn him as a Zorba. He does not get the same respect as Buddha gets. There have been very beautiful people in the same category as Zorba, but humanity has not respected them; they have been condemned.
In India there has been an ancient tradition, founded by a certain man named Brihaspati. He must have been a great

teacher, so even his enemies have called him Acharya Brihaspati. But they have destroyed all his writings, burned all his writings.

While he was alive, his philosophy was known as charuvak. Charuvak means sweet words. Perhaps he has spoken the sweetest words -- which have been burnt -- because he is no ordinary Zorba; he is one of the greatest philosophers India has produced. So his philosophy was known, when he was alive, as charuvak -- sweet words, the sweetest philosophy possible, because he said to enjoy every moment of life, that there is no other world.

Now we have no idea of his actual statements. All that we have are his distorted statements in the scriptures of those who have burned his books; in the books of his enemies, just to condemn him, to criticize him. It is not reliable, but still they must have some connection even though they may be distorted.

For example they distorted... instead of calling his philosophy charuvak, they started calling his philosophy charvak. And those two words are totally different. Charuvak means sweet words; and charvak means one who overeats -- just a philosophy of "eat, drink and be merry." They changed the name, only a slight change, but it simply destroys the whole beauty. And whatever statements we have about this man are found in their books, which are certainly not exact.

They have distorted them, just to condemn them. For example, he must have said that there is no other world -- in the same sense that I am saying there is no other world. That world is only a fiction, and for a fiction, this world -- which is a reality -- has to be sacrificed. And then a man is

given respectability. He is accepted as the awakened one, as a great prophet, as a great saint -- as God incarnated. To fulfill our expectation, many people have lived almost not in bodies but in corpses. We have made such a strange demand, and they were not courageous enough to deny us. Those who denied -- for example, Brihaspati -- his books were burnt.

In the critics' books they quote Brihaspati as saying that you can enjoy this life even if you have to borrow money, because there is no other life; so don't be worried that you will have to pay after life or that you are committing a sin. Now, this I certainly think is a distortion of the same fact that I am saying -- that there is no other world. He must have said there is no other world. He must have said to enjoy this world as much as possible -- there is no sin. But this seems to be a distortion. The critics have put the words into his mouth that you can drink as much ghee as you like, even if you have to borrow money, because there is no other life. Everybody dies, simply dies, so nobody is going to ask after life if you were a sinner or a saint. The only difference is herenow, whether you are enjoying or not. This seems to be not exactly what Brihaspati may have said. But it can give the indication that the man must have said that there is no other life, that this is the only life there is. And it continues on; there is no death, there is no god that you have to follow or worship or pray to. The only prayer is that you live a life of joy. Other than that there is no prayer.

So although his name is mentioned in the VEDAS as Acharya Brihaspati -- master, a great master, Brihaspati -- not a single book of the man has survived. And he must

have had a great following. Down the ages there may have been many people writing on the same lines, but all their books have been burnt.

In Greece there was Epicurus -- the same kind of man. They mention his name as one of the philosophers, but they don't give any importance to him over Aristotle, Plato and other Greek philosophers. He needs to be on the top, because he was trying, twenty-five centuries back, exactly what I am saying.

He lived in a small commune which was known as the garden of Epicurus where everything was uninhibitedly enjoyed. There was no marriage; there was nothing which was sin, there was nothing which was virtue. All was about living as totally as possible. And they lived in a forest immensely joyfully -- having nothing much.

Epicurus is the first man to have created a commune, and to have created a commune of Zorbas. But nothing in Greek history is mentioned about the commune in detail -- exactly what they were doing, what was their basic philosophy. It has been prevented by the religious traditions, by so-called respectability, civilization, culture -- because Epicurus seems to be rebellious.

And these people like Brihaspati and Epicurus can already be called "Zorba the Buddhas."

So what I am saying is not something of a synthesis, it is something which is very natural. We have divided nature into two parts; and both have become dead, because the Zorba will remain superficial, and the Buddha will become too serious and too dead. He will not be superficial, but he will be dead. So what is the point of attaining depth if it becomes death?

Life should attain depth, and reverence for life should be the only religion in the world. Then there is no division, and man can be healed.
This is a great challenge for the coming humanity.
That's why I go on insisting that we should discontinue with the past -- it was completely sick. Man has lived a very sick life because he created a very sick philosophy, and he followed it very seriously. We should discontinue with that sickness, howsoever respectable and howsoever ancient, and rediscover man's totality. And that can be done only when we join playfulness with reverence, when playfulness becomes a deep reverence; and when reverence does not lead you to die, to renounce, but leads you to rejoice, to dance, to celebrate.

Question 2
BELOVED OSHO,
BY NOW, MILLIONS OF PEOPLE ARE CONFUSED BY YOUR CONTRADICTORY ACTIONS AND STATEMENTS. BUT ALSO WE, YOUR FRIENDS, TEND TO DIMINISH OR SIMPLIFY YOUR WORDS. OSHO, WHAT IS AT THE HEART OF YOUR CONTRADICTIONS? HOW CAN WE ENTER YOUR WILD DANCE OF CONSCIOUSNESS?

There are no contradictions -- only apparently so.
Logically you can find hundreds of contradictions; but I am not speaking logically. Once that is understood you can see that all contradictions disappear. They are created by a

certain system of logic, and if you have the glasses of that logic on your eyes, you will see contradictions.
I am not speaking logically.
I have no respect for logic.
I have respect for life.
And life is vast enough to have contradictions as complementaries. Life cannot exist without contradictions. Logic is dead. It can exist very clinically, without contradictions. But it is a dead system -- it is just a man-made system; it does not breathe.
So there is a way to speak logically, which the philosophers have been doing down the ages. Their whole effort was not to get into any contradiction, into any inconsistency. Avoiding contradictions, avoiding inconsistencies, they have forgotten one thing -- that their philosophy becomes dead. It remains logical, but it is no longer part of a living organism.
My reverence is for life.
And life needs the tension of contradictions; otherwise it falls flat. It needs man and woman -- they are opposite polarities; they contradict each other in every possible way. That is their constant struggle, but that is also their constant attraction -- their difference in everything.
Now, nobody can say why life needs man and woman. It is possible to conceive just one sex -- either man or woman. Nature will have to make a few adjustments for procreation, for reproduction -- but life will disappear, it will lose its joy. It will become very pale and flat, colorless. Nature is always between two polar opposites -- the greater the tension, the more life.

So looked at logically, there is a contradiction. Looked at existentially, there is only complementary opposition -- but it helps to make life more playful.

You can play cards alone; there are games which can be played alone. And I saw in American jails -- people have nothing to do, they are just playing alone with cards. But you don't see any joy on their faces, because the other party is missing. There is no challenge, no adventure; they are simply deceiving themselves. In fact their game is not a game but just a deception. No one is defeated, no one wins; so there is no joy of victory, there is no pain of defeat. The game is flat.

For twelve days I was continuously watching: in every jail so many prisoners were doing only one thing -- just playing cards, because there was no other work and somehow they had to pass the time. And they are caged in different cells -- so this is good, you don't even need a partner. But you don't see any changes in their faces.

I was watching: while they were spreading their cards and finishing a game, I didn't see any change on their faces. There cannot be, because there is no tension, no adventure. They can even deceive themselves in playing, but they know it. They can always be victorious but they know that they have cheated. But whom are they cheating?

Life needs a certain tension to remain colorful. It needs a certain hide and seek -- at least it always needs a polarity. That's why, if you don't look at my statements from a logical standpoint, you will not find any contradictions; you will find only living complementaries. But if you look through logic then it is not my fault, because I am not speaking logically.

I am devoted to existence, not to any logic.
And I want to be authentic and true to existence itself, not to any system of logic.
That creates confusion in many people, but it should not create confusion in my people. And certainly they try to explain to other people that there are no contradictions. But they don't know exactly why people see contradictions. They also see it, but they cannot accept it because then that seems as if they are being defeated by others.
They should acknowledge that, seen through logic there are contradictions, because there are contradictions in life and existence. Put the logic aside and all contradictions disappear; they become complementaries and life becomes real play.
Then they need not simplify, they need not try to change my words; they need not somehow convince the other that there is no contradiction. They should be clear about it: "Looked at logically there are contradictions; we don't deny it. All that we ask is, please don't look logically, because that is not the right way to understand this man."
"He is not speaking logically, he is speaking truthfully. So if there is contradiction in life, that will be reflected in his words. And he has no obligation to any system of logic. He is obliged to express existence as closely as possible." Then you will not feel in a difficulty.
There is no need to defend me.
You cannot; there is no need. You can simply make the situation clear, that logically there are contradictions. But to look logically at a man who is not speaking logically is fundamentally wrong -- when he is saying himself to look existentially. And then all contradictions appear to be

helping each other; so much so that one cannot exist without the other.

You can see that difficulty even when people try to create fiction -- if they want it to have some quality of life. For example, they created God, which is a fiction -- but immediately they needed a devil; otherwise God would be meaningless. He needs an opposite polarity, and both are struggling. It is a fiction -- there is no God, there is no devil -- but because they had to create God, they could not avoid the devil. No religion that has accepted God has been able to avoid the devil. Religions that have not accepted God, have avoided the devil completely.

There is no devil in Jainism because there is no God. The devil comes in just to make God a reality -- at least in appearance. He gives God life; without him, God is meaningless.

And then there is tension and struggle between the two forces -- the forces of the divine and the forces of evil. And nobody can win, because that will be the end of the game. They can only continue to struggle, but never at any point of time can any one of them win. Otherwise it would have been simple for God to finish the devil, rather than allowing him to corrupt the minds of millions of people and make them do things which they don't want to do, and for which they will have to suffer in hell.

Why not destroy this devil -- just a single person -- and all sin disappears from the world; everybody becomes a saint because there is nobody to tempt him. It is strange that God goes on allowing the devil to influence people. And the devil is more influential than God himself, because there is a majority of sinners, and rarely... a very small minority of

saints. So God does not seem to be as convincing as the devil.

But God cannot kill the devil, because in killing the devil he will be committing suicide. He cannot destroy sinners, because in destroying the sinners, he will be destroying the saints. He cannot destroy hell, because in destroying hell, he will be destroying heaven.

These are contradictions. Although both are fictions, because religious people wanted them to be taken as truth, they had to make the polar opposite. And they both have to remain together, and they will always be together.

Existence, looked at directly, has no contradictions. There are polar opposites which make tension and challenge and adventure, and give color and depth to things, to small things.

And because I am speaking, not as a philosopher but as a mystic, nobody can object to my contradictions. All the mystics have been contradictory. They have to be, because they are not concerned with logic but with truth -- and truth is whatever it is. They will say it.

So there is no need to defend me. Otherwise even my people will feel angry at me, that I unnecessarily create trouble for them: I contradict, and they have to face people who show the contradiction. And because the minds of both are based on the same logic, they find it difficult: What to do? -- the contradiction is there. They also look with the same eyes as the others are looking.

They have to change their way of looking.

Then only are they really my people.

Then they will not be defending, they will simply say, "If you want to look at his statements through logic you will

find thousands of contradictions. It is up to you: if you don't want contradictions, don't look through logic."
There is no need for argument at all.
It is absolutely simple.

Question 3
BELOVED OSHO,
I AM A RASA ADDICT, AND I CAN SEE HOW THIS DEPENDENCY LEADS TO MISERY. THE COOLNESS OF MEDITATION SCARES ME THOUGH. CAN ZORBA SURVIVE THE BUDDHA, OR CAN THE BUDDHA REALLY REMAIN JUICY?

It has not been possible in the past, or only with very few individuals. With the majority of humanity it has not been possible -- the coexistence of Zorba and Buddha in one being. But the difficulty is not in Zorba and Buddha, in being a materialist and a spiritualist simultaneously: the difficulty is in our idea of what is spiritual and what is material.
We go with the division from the very beginning -- we start with the split. Then the problem arises: Can Zorba survive Buddha? Can Buddha survive Zorba or remain juicy? We begin with the split.
If you begin with the split and you accept the idea of division, certainly it will be very difficult for Buddha to be juicy, because he will fall from your respectability. You will not accept him as a Buddha. It will be difficult for Zorba to be with Buddha, because your idea of Buddha is too serious -- and Zorba is not serious.

You start with a certain idea, and then there is difficulty. It is created by you. Start living both together. In fact you are living both together without being aware of it. You are a spiritual being, and you have a material body; and both are functioning in deep synchronicity, without any conflict.
Do you see there is any conflict between your body and your soul? You can't even see where the body ends and the soul begins. They are one whole. Your awareness, your meditation, your physical health, your physical well-being -- what is the conflict between them?
Your meditation and your enjoying music -- why should it be a problem? Your meditation will make you capable of enjoying music more than an ordinary man who has no idea of meditation. And your experience of music and its depth will help to make your meditation more juicy, more musical, not so dry, not so dead -- more alive.
Where is the contradiction?
Why should there be any contradiction?
Your love and your spiritual growth are the same process. It is just like you cannot walk with one leg alone; you need two legs to walk. There is no conflict. Both legs function in a deep synchronicity. And that twoness is all over you.
Both my hands are making one gesture. They are not making two gestures, they are making one gesture. Although the hands are two, the gesture is one -- and there is no conflict. And both of your hands are connected with the two sides of your brain, and while both hands are making one gesture, both sides of the brain are speaking; it is not just one side.

Man should be aware that many musical instruments can play together, and they will create one music; it will be an orchestra.

So there will be no question that Zorba cannot survive Buddha. It is Zorba who is becoming Buddha. The Buddha is not somebody else; it is Zorba, finding not only joy in small things of life, but also joy in his own being. That's all that a Buddha is. And there is no contradiction.

If I enjoy being silent, I enjoy speaking too, because whatever happens in silence needs to be given and shared in words -- however difficult it may be. But my silence and my words are just two wings.

If a man is dumb and deaf, do you think he will be in silence? Logically it would seem he will be in silence -- that's why I say logic is not relevant to life. The man who is dumb and deaf will not be in silence, because he has not known sound. Without knowing sound you cannot know silence. That is the basic complementary which looks contradictory in logic.

When silence becomes sound, it is expression. When sound becomes silent, it is the gathering of the juice. When silence becomes sound, it is sharing. But they are both together, in a different way.

People think that blind people must be living in darkness. That is logically right, existentially wrong. The man who has not seen light cannot see darkness. It is impossible. And if a man can see darkness, he is not blind. How can he see darkness? Seeing needs eyes.

So the blind man does not have any idea of darkness because he cannot see light. When you close your eyes you certainly see darkness because you are aware of light. But

the blind man has never opened his eyes and has never seen light; so he lives in a third space which cannot be named because there is no word for him. Seeing is nonexistential to him: he simply does not see, neither light nor darkness.
What I am indicating is that where you see a duality between body and soul, between Zorba and Buddha, your question is: Can Zorba survive Buddha? Can Buddha remain juicy?
In fact only a Zorba can be a Buddha, and only a Buddha can be a Zorba. Zorba alone, without being a Buddha, is very superficial. Buddha alone, without being a Zorba, has depth, but no life. Together there will be depth, and there will be playfulness -- and life and love and celebration.
So you need not be afraid of meditation; it will not kill your experience of rasa, it will enhance it. And your experience of rasa, juice, will enhance your meditativeness. Never be afraid of opposites. Don't choose one; that's where man has got into trouble. Choose both together and you will remain whole.
Perhaps people will not see Buddha in you -- so what? Who cares whether people recognize the Buddha or not?
Certainly a Buddha cannot care; he is not worried about recognition. Perhaps it will be difficult for people because they have always accepted a Buddha who has killed his Zorba, who is almost a murderer of half his being.
They have accepted, they have respected him. They cannot accept and they cannot respect... at least for the time being, till it becomes a universal phenomenon. It will not fit with their old categories.
But you need not be worried. The worry is also coming from the old categories; somehow they are hanging in the

mind: "If I become a meditator, perhaps it will destroy my rasa. All my juice will be finished; then I cannot love, then I cannot paint, then I cannot play music, then I cannot enjoy a joke." This is sheer stupidity: the Buddha becomes more and more sensitive.

Meditative awareness does not kill your experience of juice, rasa, it deepens it -- although it is going to be difficult for the world to accept. But there is no need for any recognition. If you are fulfilled and whole, that's what is needed. And if both are there -- the Zorba and Buddha, the experience of rasa and the experience of meditation together -- they will be just like darkness and light.

Don't choose between darkness and light, because choosing one is dangerous. If you choose light, you cannot close your eyes; your eyes cannot have a rest. You will drive yourself mad because your eyes continuously need to open and close. That is a moment of rest, cleansing. Any dust coming onto your eyes is wiped away. Your eyelids are functioning like wipers, always bringing liquid to the eyes and cleaning them, continuously keeping them clean so you can see with clarity.

If your eyelids are taken away, soon you will be blind because your eyes will get dry, they will shrink. They will be covered with dust, they will lose all juice and life. And they are the most delicate part of your body. So your body is very protective. If you choose darkness, then you cannot open your eyes; then you are choosing blindness.

And that's how it has always been.

People have been choosing.

I teach choicelessness.

And choicelessness means both together, both the opposites together; we are not going to choose one.
In the UPANISHADS there is a prayer, the most famous prayer, but absolutely wrong. The prayer is: "Lead me from darkness to light." That means, "Lead me from Zorba to Buddha, lead me from death to life, lead me from untruth to truth." It looks very innocent -- it is not so.
If you have understood what I am saying, it is a very dangerous prayer. It is choice: choosing between darkness and light, it chooses light. But you need both. Light alone will drive you insane. You need the silence of darkness, the rest of darkness too.
Light is a tension, it is tiring. Darkness is nourishment, it is rejuvenating.
You cannot choose. Whoever wrote that prayer -- which is the most famous prayer in Hinduism -- is utterly wrong because he is making choices. He is choosing life against death. That is not possible.
Life and death are in a dynamic relationship. Death is a rest and a renewal; life alone will become really boredom. Death is something closer to sleep, a deeper sleep which one needs between two lives, so the old life is completely erased, and you are clean again to be reborn, renewed, fresh. If you choose only life you will be only getting older and older and older -- and bored. And if there is no death, it will be terrible.
You would like to die at a certain point because you have experienced everything that life can give. Now how long can you go on repeating the same thing? -- a hundred years, two hundred years, three hundred years, a thousand years...

but a day is bound to come when you will wish, "Give me death! I don't want life anymore because I want to rest."
And untruth and truth -- they are not to be chosen. Untruth and truth, both are needed together, because the untruth makes you aware of the truth. The untruth also has a function to fulfill: without knowing the false, you will never know the true. You have to be capable of knowing both -- and the man of awareness knows both.
He knows what is untrue and what is true. It is not that he knows only the truth -- awareness simply makes him aware of the distinction between the untruth and the truth. But he knows both, and he knows the essential relationship between the two -- that they are as related as life and death, as light and darkness, and they cannot be separated.
Don't ask for one thing -- remain choiceless.
And choicelessness will bring the Zorba to Buddhahood, without destroying the Zorba and without taking the juice out of Buddha.
And the world will be immensely enriched by people who have the depth of a Buddha and also the playfulness of a Zorba.

Light on the Path
Chapter #32
Chapter title: Only your original face can become enlightend
6 February 1986 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,

YOU DESCRIBE WITNESSING AS A KNACK. OFTEN, LATE AT NIGHT, WHEN I AM IN A VERY RELAXED STATE, WITNESSING HAPPENS. AT OTHER TIMES, THOUGH, IT JUST SEEMS TO BE MIND WATCHING MIND WATCHING MIND.
PLEASE COMMENT ON THIS KNACK.

The moment I say that witnessing is a knack, it implies that there is no way to explain it, no way to teach someone about it, no way to train someone in it.
That's the whole meaning of the word "knack."
I can say things which are close enough, but they can never be exact descriptions of the knack. It is not an art, not a craft that can be explained in detail, step by step. But if it is happening to you, there is no problem. You should know what it is, you should know the taste of it.
The problem is arising because you must be trying to do it; not allowing the knack to happen, but trying to make an art of it, so that you can control it. Man wants to control everything; it is part of his basic ego.
The knack cannot be controlled. Either you know it or you don't know it. You can play around it, and sometimes by chance you stumble upon it: suddenly you have come to know it. That is the moment when you have to be aware in what situation it is happening.
In the night, when you are relaxed, you find it happening. That gives you a clue that relaxation, not an effort to attain witnessing, allows the knack to happen. At other times when you are trying, making an effort, an endeavor to get it, then it is mind watching mind watching mind. It is always the mind.

Mind cannot get the knack.
Mind can learn any art, any technique, any craft: a knack is beyond it. It is not its language, it is not its world. A knack is something beyond mind.
So you have to be clearly aware: the thing is happening to you, the failure of the mind is happening to you. Whenever you are trying, you watch -- then you find that it is mind watching another part of the mind. And then you find the one who has found this is also another part of the mind. And this can go on ad infinitum.
Mind is capable of dividing itself infinitely. But finally you will find only mind -- you will not come to meditation, you will not come to witnessing.
So your failure is helpful. It says, "Don't make the effort, don't try." Your success indicates that it happens when you are relaxed, when you are not trying. In relaxation, mind is no longer functioning. The mind is going to be in sleep, it is ready to go into sleep; it is not going into an effort because effort will keep you awake. You cannot fall into sleep by effort.
Sleep and witnessing have something in common.
You cannot make the effort -- one thing. Every effort is going to be a failure -- another thing. Unless you learn that every effort fails, you cannot get the knack. But once in a while when your mind is getting ready to go to sleep -- inbetween, when you are still awake, and the mind is relaxing to go into sleep -- suddenly, witnessing happens. You have got the knack!
Now don't ask me what it is. That may destroy even your night witnessing, because you may start trying it. Just let it happen as it is happening in the night. You can, at the most,

create the same atmosphere whenever you want it to happen, and wait. You cannot force it.
One has to learn a great lesson -- that there are things beyond you which you cannot force; you can only remain open, available, waiting, and they come.
The moment you become tense to get hold of them, they slip away.
It is just like, in the open fist you have all the air possible. With the closed fist all the air disappears. You may be thinking that with a closed fist you are catching hold of the air. No, it has slipped out. It does not belong to the closed fist, it belongs only to the open hand -- and it is easily available. You just have to see when it happens, what the surroundings are.
The surroundings mean you are going into sleep, you are tired of the whole day's work -- you don't want to work anymore. In the gap, before the mind slips into sleep and you lose consciousness -- the mind is preparing, is getting ready to go into sleep, but you are still awake -- in that minute gap, witnessing happens.
Now, you cannot try the knack.
You can simply create the outer situation.
In the day, anytime, let the mind go into relaxation. Don't try -- as if you are going to create witnessing: you are simply allowing mind to rest. And at a certain point, that same gap will appear, and in the gap descends the witness. This is the mystery of a knack -- its strangeness and its simplicity too.

Question 2
BELOVED OSHO,

SMALL CHILDREN LOVE SOMEONE RUNNING AFTER THEM. EVEN THOUGH THEY RUN AWAY AS FAST AS THEY CAN, FINALLY THEY WANT TO BE CAUGHT.
SOMETHING SIMILAR SEEMS TO BE GOING ON BETWEEN MASTER AND DISCIPLE. IT IS SO HILARIOUS, YET SAD ALSO, BECAUSE WITH MY FEAR OF SPONTANEITY, I PREVENT YOU FROM CATCHING ME, EVEN THOUGH I WANT TO BE CAUGHT.
PLEASE COMMENT.

It is exactly the true description of what is happening between a master and a disciple. And the similarity with children is significant.
The master has already become a child -- the disciple is on the way to becoming a child. But this is the whole game of existence. It looks contradictory through the eyes of logic. That's why I insistently emphasize that logic is not the way of life; it does not describe life. And what it describes is something dead.
Life functions through strange contradictions.
Small children run fast to escape being caught, but deep down there is a yearning to be caught too. Why this contradiction? Running away is a joy in that you are not able to catch the child, that the child is no more a child: he can run faster than you. He is proving his mettle.
But no child is so uncompassionate that he will defeat you; so finally he wants to be caught. In the interval he wants to enjoy your failure. In the end he wants to give you the gift of success too.

And something similar is always happening between the master and the disciple. It is a little more subtle and it is more complex because the running is not outward, it is something inner. And the disciple is not a child anymore. For the master the game is exactly the same.

From the master's side he will allow the disciple to run as fast as he can to give him the joy of knowing that he can escape. But the disciple cannot be allowed to escape -- that would be against the compassion of the master, because if he is allowed to escape he will remain unreborn. He will never become a child, he will never become innocent; he will remain miserable.

The master knows when to catch you, but he gives enough rope. The problem is the disciple -- because master and disciple are not at the same stage of consciousness. The disciple is running -- he has become a disciple just to be caught. There was no other need. He wants to be transformed by the master -- and that can happen only if he is caught. But he is afraid of many things.

He will lose his ego, his identity; he will lose his individuality: he will no longer be himself. The moment he is caught looks like a death; hence there is fear. He wants, desires to be caught because he can see the beauty of the master -- his light, his newly-achieved, fresh consciousness. He would also like to have all these, so he wants to be caught. But the complexity is that he wants all these things while remaining himself, as he is. And that is impossible. And the master is not going to catch you -- although he can catch you at any moment -- he is not going to catch you unless you are totally willing, because it will be useless to

catch you against yourself. There will be no point because there will be no communion.
To catch you while you are resisting being caught is absolutely futile. The master will catch you only when he sees that you have dropped all fear, all anxiety. And your fear and your anxiety are all imaginary.
You will certainly lose the ego.
But you will gain the self.
Ego is a false entity -- you are not losing anything in fact; you are simply becoming aware that it had never existed. You had simply been forced to believe in it.
And you will get your original self; so there is no loss, there is no question of fear. You are
not going to lose your individuality either.
But in a confused mind, which is basically the mind of the disciple... he mistakes his personality for his individuality, just as he takes his ego to be his self.
Ego is a false phenomenon created by the society -- so is personality. Ego is the false center that the society has given to you in place of your real being. And the personality is the false individuality that the society has created, as a circumference to the center of the ego. So you are caught in a net with the false personality and the false ego. And unless they both disappear, you cannot see what is behind the curtain of the false; you cannot see the original self, you cannot see your individuality.
The master is certainly going to destroy your personality, but not your individuality. He will take away everything that the society has imposed upon you. And in taking away everything imposed by the society, he is simply taking that which you don't have, but which you only believe you

have. Once he has taken all the falsities, you will discover the original self, the original face.
But the master gives as much rope as possible, because nothing can be done against you.
So it is good to run a little bit, just as a game; but to go on running forever is stupid. That means you have taken your fear too seriously, not knowing that the fear is absolutely ungrounded. The master will make every effort to make you aware that your fear is ungrounded. You will lose only that which you don't have. And you will get only that which you really have.
The moment this becomes clear to you, you will allow the master to catch you. And unless you allow him, nothing can be done. The master cannot be impatient about it.
The act of transformation of the disciple is an act of his free choice. If the master forces it upon you, it will be again something false.
That is being done by organized religions. They don't give you rope, they don't allow you to run away. They catch hold of you immediately, as you are born, so that you cannot run away at all. Till you go to the grave, the organized religion keeps its hold on you -- from the cradle to the grave.
Even after you are dead, they take every step that you cannot escape. They don't allow you freedom even after you are dead. They start from birth, and they continue to keep a hold on you through marriage till death comes over you. Everything happens in the church: the baptism of the child, the circumcision of the child, the marriage, the death. Finally, the last sermon over the dead body is to be given by the priest.

The old religions don't give you any moment to run away. And the people who choose teachers from traditional religions... those teachers won't allow you any freedom. They will impose all kinds of falsities on you.
And this is the beauty and the wonder, that you are not afraid of them! You are afraid only when you come across a real master.
Who is afraid of the priest? Who is afraid of the rabbi? Nobody is afraid of those people -- and they are doing every harm to you that can be done. But you accept it because all that harm goes on nourishing your ego, your personality.
The whole function of organized religion is to keep you away from your real self, your original face, your individuality. The master's function is different.
An ancient parable in the East is that a lioness, while taking a jump from one hillock to another hillock, in the middle of the jump gave birth to a child. The cub fell, on the way, into a crowd of sheep. The sheep nourished the cub, not knowing that it was a lion -- their enemy. And the cub never came to know that he was a lion because everybody around him was a sheep. So he walked in the crowd of sheep, just like a sheep.
Sheep never walk alone; they walk as a crowd, almost stepping on each other, rubbing their bodies against each other. They are afraid to be alone; it is dangerous to be alone, any wild animal can catch hold of them -- they have to be together.
Lions walk alone, never in a crowd.
Lions have a very big territory. They don't want anybody to enter their territory. Sometimes it is an area of miles that

one lion will have as his territory. No other lion can even manage to get in; otherwise there is going to be a ferocious fight till one is dead, or perhaps both are dead. And they walk alone.

But this poor lion had no idea that he was a lion; he had no idea how he looked. He became bigger and bigger, but the sheep had become accustomed to him; they had been bringing him up from his very childhood. Although he was a strange sheep, he was a sheep because he used to eat grass, which lions don't eat. They would rather die, but they will not eat grass.

He used to eat grass -- he remained vegetarian. He used to go into the crowd, just in the middle, to be safe, although he was taller, bigger, but without any idea of it. And he never roared once like a lion, because if you don't have that idea, how can you roar? He dreamed like a sheep, feared like a sheep, was afraid of wild animals who could not do any harm to him.

One day an old lion saw this scene. He could not believe his eyes! The young lion was so big, and he had never seen a lion and sheep mixing; there has never been any friendship, there is no possibility. The sheep were going with the lion without any fear, and the lion was also going with the sheep, afraid to be alone.

The old lion could not believe his eyes. He ran after the crowd. Naturally, all the sheep started running and making the noise sheep make. And the young lion was also making the same noise. It took much effort; only with great difficulty could the old lion catch hold of the young lion. And the young lion was crying and weeping, just like a sheep.

The old lion dragged the young fellow to a nearby pond. The young lion was very much afraid; he was not willing to go, he was very reluctant. And he was more powerful than the old lion. If the young lion had known that he was a lion, the old lion would not have been able to pull him to the pond; he would have killed him. But he was a sheep, so he allowed the old lion to pull him -- although reluctantly, unwillingly, resisting -- knowing that this was sure death, because many sheep had died, had been killed by the lions. Now his turn had come.

But at the pond a miracle happened: the old lion said to the young one, "My son, just look into the pond" -- where they both were reflected. And there was a sudden transformation, because the sheep was not a reality, it was just a false idea implanted by the society in which the lion was brought up. It was his personality, but not his individuality. It was his ego, but not his real self. It was just a mask, but not his original face.

For the first time he looked at both the faces; and suddenly there was a roar. From the depths of his being came a great roar shaking the hills around.

The old lion said, "My work is done. All that I could do, I have done -- now you are on your own. Now you know who you are."

The master's function is exactly the same.

This parable is about the master and the disciple -- not about the lion and the sheep. Every effort is made by the master so that you are not afraid of him. His love, his compassion... he does not make you afraid because he knows that already there will be great fear in you. If he

creates more fear you will be running away faster than ever. He helps you in every way to drop all fear.

And this is my final effort -- to call myself your friend; not to be a "master," because that very word creates fear. That very word creates distance. Then the disciple is always trembling with the idea that some day he is going to be caught; and who knows what is going to happen afterwards when his ego is destroyed, his personality is destroyed? Who knows whether something will remain behind or whether everything will be gone and he will become only a shadow? -- the shadow of the master.

To withdraw that fear also I want you to know that I am just a friend, and you can allow me to catch you. You can give it a try. If you feel that it is going to destroy you, you can tell me to stop even in the middle. I will stop... because without your will nothing can be done. Without your will, if something is done, you will undo it again. You will create the old falsities, and you will never come close to a master again in your life. You will find so many arguments, and you will be listening to the arguments from people who are not close to me.

They create all kinds of arguments why they are not close to me. They have to prove to their minds that I must be wrong, that I am dangerous, that I am not the master you are searching for, that, "This man is a fraud." All these ideas they will be creating and finding some proofs and supports for, so that they can remain far away.

I have already attracted them; they have already been dreaming of being close to me, and they are destroying their dreams, their fantasies of being close to me. All their argumentation is not against me, it is against their own

transformation. They are afraid: "It is better not to come close to such a person."

But those who have come close, they are also keeping as far away as possible, for the simple reason... the same reason. One day you will have to decide that it is a beautiful game to run for a little while -- a good exercise -- but don't forget that you have to be caught too. And the master is not going to catch you against yourself. His very work is such that it prohibits him doing anything against your will.

And once you are ready, courageous enough to go into the whole process of being close to the master whatever happens; once the adventure has taken possession of you -- and sooner or later it does take possession, you cannot go on running forever.... Sooner or later you get tired of running. Sooner or later you start seeing your contradiction: that you are a disciple and you are running. Then either don't be a disciple, or don't run -- this is contradictory. Sooner or later you start seeing the compassion of the master. He could have caught you, but he has allowed you to run. He has been waiting for the moment when you are willing to be caught. And that is a moment of tremendous value, when the disciple simply stops and wants to be caught. He has come to a very decisive moment.

If it means to die as an ego, as a personality, he is ready. He wants to know whether there is anything behind the facade of personality, or nothing. He is ready to accept it even if there is nothing. The moment he is ready to accept even that, then there is no problem. If he is ready to die, then he will be reborn; and the rebirth is the coming back home. Then the disciple also becomes a child.

And it is something to be understood, that two minds are two, but two persons meditating are one. Two persons thinking are two; two persons non-thinking are one because there is no distinction, no boundary -- both are in the same state. Thoughts will be different, will draw a boundary of separation. But no-thought has no boundary and no distinctions, no differences.
Two innocent beings are one.
Once the disciple is reborn, he is no longer separate from the master inwardly. Inwardly he becomes one, because two innocences, two no-minds, two silences, cannot remain two.
They are bound to become one because both are infinite. They are going to overlap each other.

Question 3
BELOVED OSHO,
WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A DISCIPLE AND A FRIEND? HAS THE TRANSFORMATION AMONGST THE SANNYASINS ALREADY HAPPENED?

The distinction between a disciple and a friend has two sides to it. First, from the side of the master it has happened. I don't have any disciples anymore. You can relax.
From the disciples' side it is going differently for different people. A few are relaxed -- the transformation has taken place. A few are getting to be relaxed; a few are thinking to relax.

A few are unwillingly accepting the idea because to be a disciple was better: the master was responsible. Now the whole responsibility is thrown on you -- and nobody wants to be responsible. Everybody wants to get rid of responsibility.

There are a few who have not even heard it. They have listened to me, but it has not reached to their hearts. They still remain disciples.

So it will be different with different people, but sooner or later it has to be with every disciple, as far as I am concerned. He will have to come to drop the idea of disciplehood, and just be a friend.

Your mind may give many arguments against it. You have to see through those arguments, that they are phony. For example, the mind may give very valid-looking arguments; such as, in going from being a disciple to a master to becoming his friend, you are losing reverence for the master.

That is not true. In fact, a master who allows you to be his friend is worthy of more reverence than any master who does not allow you to be his friend, who keeps you on a lower level -- almost in a spiritual slavery as a disciple -- and demands of you that you surrender, that you be committed. He asks you to trust him, but he does not trust you; otherwise there is no need to say, "Trust me."

If I trust you, why is there a need to ask? My trust is enough: and my trust will know your trust, because trust creates a synchronicity, just as love creates a synchronicity.

The masters who ask for surrender may be playing a game of spiritual ego. If they ask for commitment only to them, that means they are still living with the idea of

possessiveness, monopoly, and they are afraid of losing you: you may get interested in somebody else. To avoid all those fears they want you to be committed so that you start feeling guilty if you feel some affinity with somebody else too.

A friend has no possessiveness.

A friend wants you to be happy, wants you to be free, wants you to have all the joys of life, and has no conditions. But a friend cannot take responsibility for you: he cannot be your savior.

He can help you on the path, he can show you the path, but you have to be strong enough to follow the path, to go alone like a lion.

Disciples go like sheep in a crowd. The bigger the crowd, the better the disciples feel; it is cozier, warmer, more comfortable. Just seeing that there are six hundred million Catholics, the pope feels that he must be a man of God; otherwise why should six hundred million people be following him?

It is a strange game of the ego. The crowd of sheep makes the so-called master feel that he is the shepherd. And then he starts making the crowd bigger, because a bigger crowd will make him a bigger shepherd, who owns more people. That becomes his number, his trip.

But these are not real masters. If the crowd leaves them, they will suddenly see themselves reduced to ordinary men -- which in reality they are. It was the crowd which had given them a very magnified idea of themselves.

If a master allows the disciples to be friends, he is dispersing the crowd. He is making a personal contact. He is giving you equal status spiritually although he knows

that much is still only potential in you, and much work has to be done so that it becomes actual. But whether it is potential or actual, your spiritual status is not lower.
That is the meaning when a master changes disciples into friends. He is giving you the recognition that you are as capable as himself. You may not be aware -- that does not make any difference. At least to him it does not make any difference. To you it makes a difference that you are not aware, but that is the work that you have to do. And the work can be done more lovingly in friendship, in love, than it can be done in a certain relationship in which you are lower, inferior, a sinner -- and somebody else is higher, superior, a saint.
I don't think the reverence for such a man who makes you his friends will be less. It will be more. So don't listen to your arguments which will try to keep you in the old relationship.
It has never been done, it is true, but you can see the result: the whole humanity is proof -- so many masters and so many disciples... and the world is just in a mess. People are as mad as ever. No basic change in humanity has happened. Something in the fundamentals has to be changed. And this is one of the fundamentals: the relationship between the master and the disciple. It has to be changed. A new dimension has to be given to it. And once it becomes a transforming force, in the future no master will be able to go on playing the old game.
This can become a milestone.
But as far as I am concerned, it is absolutely a fact. As far as you are concerned, there are degrees. But it has to be in you too -- a one hundred percent change from disciplehood

to friendship. And you will see a miracle happen, because love has never been praised so much, friendship has never been raised so high; and my whole effort is to make everything that is mundane, sacred.

Question 4
BELOVED OSHO,
I HAVE HEARD YOU SAY, "LET GO -- NO EFFORT IS NEEDED." BUT I AM AFRAID OF LETTING GO BECAUSE THEN I SLIP INTO MY OLD PATTERNS. PLEASE COMMENT.

It is one of the difficulties. Letting go, one can slip into old patterns, old conditionings. Still, take the risk.
The fear has some validity; you can fall back into your old patterns. But don't be afraid, just remain watchful; and meanwhile, if it happens that way.... It is not necessarily so that it will happen to everybody, to fall into old patterns. Only those friends who have forced themselves into the new discipline will find it happening, that if they let go they will become their old selves.
But it will be good, because that will show you that whatever you were thinking you had become, you have not become. It was just an enforced, controlled, suppressed, inhibited phenomenon. Letting go will make it clear to you. So it is going to help both kinds of people. Those who have grown up into the new lifestyle by letting go, they will go higher. Those who have forced themselves into the new lifestyle, and in whom there has been a resistance somewhere, a part fighting against it -- if they let go, that part is going to take over. That too is good. You will

become aware that what you were thinking you are, you are not.

Watch the old pattern, and now don't try to repress it. It has to be dropped -- not repressed. Repression is through discipline, and dropping is through witnessing. Watch the old pattern as a witness. Don't get identified with it.

And as you move from the new lifestyle that you have forced, if you continue to watch and remain in a let-go, even when you see the old pattern emerging, that too will disappear, because that too is forced, forced by society. That too is not natural. And when everything forced has disappeared, only then are you your natural being.

To me, to be natural is to be spiritual.

All the religions have been teaching something very idiotic: to be natural is against spirituality. So everybody has repressed the natural self and has been pretending to be a spiritual self -- which he is not. All the religions together have conspired against humanity to create hypocrites.

My effort is to create the natural man -- human, with no guilt, accepting all the frailties, failures the human being is prone to.

In this deep acceptance of your natural being is the seed of your transformation. And when it comes by itself then it is a growth. When you force it, it is not a growth, it is just wearing a mask. And even before a mirror you can befool yourself wearing a mask: you can start thinking that this is your face.

Letting go means your masks will slip down, your personality will slip down, your ego will slip down.

Go on till all these things disappear, till the moment you find a crystal-clear naturalness, a spontaneity of being.

So there is no need to be afraid. Most of you will find that whatever you have does not go -- it is growth. A few of you will find that you have just managed something -- it has not been a real growth; you have been pretending. Then you will fall into the old pattern.
This time don't make the same mistake again. Remain watchful and go on in the same process of letting go. Your old patterns are also false; they will also disappear. If the let-go is complete it will leave you in your natural self, in your authentic being. And to me that is the beginning of self-realization, the beginning of your enlightenment.
But it can begin only when you have found the natural source of your being. Your pretended selves, your hypocrite patterns, your masks -- they cannot become enlightened.
Only your original face can become enlightened.
So to be original and natural is the most important thing for a traveler on the path.

Question 5
BELOVED OSHO,
WHAT MAKES YOU LAUGH?

You all!

Light on the Path
Chapter #33
Chapter title: Truth is a dance in the heart
7 February 1986 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
PUTTING TOGETHER ALL YOUR STATEMENTS ABOUT ONE SUBJECT OR QUESTION, THERE ARE NOT JUST CONTRADICTIONS, BUT SUCH A RICHNESS OF DIFFERENT VIEWPOINTS AND ANGLES FROM WHICH YOU LOOK AT THE QUESTION... SO MANY COLORS. WHEN YOU TALK ABOUT A CERTAIN SUBJECT, SOMETHING IN ME STARTS DANCING, REMEMBERING SOME OF THE ANSWERS YOU HAVE GIVEN BEFORE.
WHAT'S HAPPENING?

Every time one realizes something of the truth, there is a dance in the heart.
The heart is the only testimony for the truth.
And it cannot testify through words. It can testify in its own way: trough love, through dance, through playing music: nonverbal -- it speaks, but it does not speak in language and logic.
And this is a realization of a certain truth which many people go on missing. They think what I am saying is contradictory, because they are thinking -- and thinking is a logical process. And logic can never see beyond contradictions; it has no way to bridge contradictions.
Logic is a divider, not a joiner.
The whole of humanity is divided by the mind: the Christian from the Hindu, the Mohammedan from the Jew, the Indian from the American, the German from the Italian. Mind goes on dividing -- divisions within divisions within

divisions. Even Christianity is not one, it is divided -- into Catholics and Protestants. And the Protestants are not one, they are divided.

Mind's whole function is to go on dividing.

The function of the heart is to see the joining link about which the mind is completely blind.

When someone finds contradictions in my statements, he has no understanding from the heart; otherwise things will be very simple.

I have been answering different people. When I answer somebody, I am answering him, his needs; and he is the focus of my whole effort. When I am answering somebody else, the question may be the same, but the questioner is not the same.

A philosopher remains consistent because he answers the question. The mystic cannot remain consistent because he answers the questioner -- and the questioners are always different. Their qualities are different, their receptivities are different, their potentialities are different. Their past is different, their present is different, their future is different -- although the question may be the same.

The problem is whether to answer the question or the questioner. If you answer the question and do not care at all about the questioner, your answer is going to be bookish; it has no spirit in it. It is not a personal communion.

This is one of the reasons that none of the enlightened masters of the world has ever written a book. It cannot be just coincidence. They were immensely educated, cultured people, most of them from royal families -- very rich, very talented. But what happened when they became enlightened was that they always chose the spoken word. And the

reason is this: they didn't want to answer the questions -- in a book you can answer only the questions -- they wanted to answer the questioner.

In a book you cannot take care of the questioner. You don't know who is going to read it -- it cannot have a personal intimacy. It is not addressed to anyone in particular; it is unaddressed -- just to whomsoever it may concern.

None of the enlightened masters has ever written a single word. Consistently, in different parts of the world, in different times, they have always fallen upon the spoken word, because the spoken word has a warmth. The written word is cold, dead; the spoken word is breathing, it has a heartbeat.

Hence there are bound to be contradictions. But they are not contradictions: they are simply different people responded to in different ways with different words. They are given what they need. The question is just an excuse. Behind the question is a living being.

If the question is arising only out of the mind, then an enlightened master is not going to answer it, because that will be a futile effort. The mind cannot understand that which is beyond words; it can understand only that which is linguistically, logically right. It has no concern with existence, with life, with reality.

Mind itself is a fiction.

You can live without mind; you cannot live without heart. And the deeper you live, the more of your heart is involved. When your total heart is involved, then your questions have a totally different quality to them.

And I am answering people, not questions; naturally my answers will be different. You can go on asking the same

question every day: my answer cannot be the same every day because you are not the same every day. It may be the same questioner; but life is flowing, it is a river, a constant flux. People think of themselves as static. Only things are static; only death is unchanging -- life is constantly changing. More life -- and more change. Abundant life -- and there is tremendous change each moment.

So even if the same person goes on asking the same question, my answer cannot be the same, because in between his two questions so much water has flowed down the Ganges. Neither he is the same, nor I am the same, nor the existence is the same: everything has changed. The whole context is different.

When one lives moment to moment this is bound to happen.

Logic will think the answers are contradictions, and will miss the point. The heart will think they are different aspects, different colors of the rainbow -- different viewpoints, different angles.

And it will have a dance, because that is its way of saying, "Yes, I understand."

Question 2

BELOVED OSHO,

YOU HAVE SAID, THE WHEEL OF TRUTH NEEDS TO BE TURNED AGAIN AND AGAIN. SEEING THE EFFORTS OF SO MANY COUNTRIES TO PREVENT YOU FROM MEETING YOUR FRIENDS, THE QUESTION ARISES: IS THE TURNING OF THE WHEEL MORE DIFFICULT THAN EVER?

It is more difficult than ever -- but it is, at the same time, more challenging than ever, too. It is with more excitement, more ecstasy.

It is difficult for the simple reason that the earth has become very small. Gautam Buddha, twenty-five centuries back, never moved out of a small state, Bihar, in India. He never even went through the whole of India. Just walking, he could not manage; forty-two years he was speaking, but he could reach only a small portion of the earth.

The same is true about Mahavira, about Parshwanatha, and Socrates. Socrates never went out of Athens; there were different reasons. Athens was the only cultured city in the whole world, and if Athens was unable to understand Socrates, he knew it would be simply futile to go anywhere. Whatever he said would just go above their heads.

When he was sentenced to death by the court, it was absolutely unjustified. The opponents had not been able to prove anything against him -- and he had answered all the opponents so beautifully and so totally. But Athens was a city-state, a direct democracy: all the people had the right to vote, and all the people had the right to decide things of importance -- and there could have never been a more important problem than whether to keep Socrates alive or kill him.

Socrates was the cream of the whole Athenian intelligence. But when you ask the mediocre people -- who are in the majority... they had heard Socrates' arguments, but they could not understand. They were absolutely deaf. The way he was speaking was the way he had always spoken in his school; and that school was meant for the highest qualities of mysticism. Those qualities were not in the audience.

It was a majority-decision that he should be sentenced to death. It seems the judge who had to declare the judgment of the majority did understand that something ugly was happening, because he could see Socrates had answered everything that had been asked and had satisfied the court completely; and that all condemnation about him was just false -- it had no foundation in truth.

Seeing this... but the majority voted that he should be poisoned; that was the Athenian way of crucifying a person -- more cultured, more human. Seeing this, the judge gave alternatives on his own authority.

He said to Socrates, "The majority has decided that you should be poisoned, but I want to give a few alternatives to you. You can leave Athens, never come back to Athens, so as far as Athenian people are concerned, you are dead -- you will not be coming back. That will fulfill their desire. It is enough, more than enough, that you are not here. What harm can you do to the people?

"Second, if you choose to remain in Athens -- because I understand you, you may not like to leave Athens -- then stop speaking. That too will be perfectly fulfilling to the people, because they say whatsoever you are teaching is corrupting the youth. So if you are not teaching, you are as dead as one can be; their purpose is fulfilled."

But Socrates said, "You are putting me in a very difficult situation. I cannot choose not to speak, for the simple reason that truth has an intrinsic quality: it wants to be spoken. You cannot hold it in; it is not humanly possible.

"And I cannot go against truth just for a few years of life. I am already old -- any moment death may come. So just for

an uncertain, small period of life, I cannot go against truth, and I cannot do things just to save myself.

"I will continue to speak the truth to my last breath, while I am alive. You are kind enough to suggest to me that I can leave Athens. You know perfectly well I cannot do that either, because if Athens -- which is the most cultured city in the whole world -- has decided to kill me, where do you think I can survive? I will be killed anywhere, and in a far more primitive way.

"And I feel this time is perfectly suitable, because I have said everything that I wanted to say. This case against me has been of tremendous help to me: I have completed my work, I have used the court and given all the arguments that were incomplete. I have completed everything -- now there is no need....

"And in a barbarous place they will not be able to tolerate me even for one day. I am grateful to Athens: it has allowed me a long life. It is simply unfortunate that, although it is the most cultured place, it is still not totally cultured. And that has been my whole effort. But I love this place, and I would like to die here."

Socrates could not move out of Athens for the simple reason: who was going to understand him? A great discipline and training is needed to understand a man of the caliber of Socrates. He had a school where other teachers prepared people, and when they were ready, then finally they became students of Socrates. It was in the final stage, to give them the last touches, that Socrates was useful. He could not teach a person from scratch -- that was simply impossible for that genius. So naturally he was confined.

Buddha was confined to Bihar. One thing was language. He used to speak a local language, Pali, which was not understood anywhere else. Sanskrit was understood by the scholars all over India. Buddha could have used Sanskrit -- he was perfectly trained, disciplined in Sanskrit -- but he was against using a dead language.

He was against the monopoly of the priests and the scholars who were insisting that all the scriptures should remain in Sanskrit so the people could not read them. You will be surprised: Sanskrit has never been a living language -- it has never been spoken by people -- and it is the mother language of almost all the cultured languages of the world, of the East and of the West. They are all sister languages, born out of a language which was never spoken by any people, except a few chosen scholars in the universities.

Buddha was against speaking a language which had been used against the people, to keep them ignorant. He chose Pali, a language which people understood. It was a revolutionary step; before him, nobody had dared. It was thought that truth could be spoken only in Sanskrit. That's what the brahmins in India have been saying for thousands of years -- that Sanskrit is a divine language.

Buddha made many revolutionary statements: one was that no language is divine -- it is the experience of divineness.... Then you can use any language, and it becomes divine. And he proved it by making Pali a divine language, so all the Buddhist scriptures are in Pali. Language was a barrier. Even in India today, there are thirty national languages. In Buddha's times there must have been more, because there were two thousand kingdoms in India. It was divided into

two thousand small fragments. And he remained in one fragment.

Secondly, he was prevented from moving on a wider scale, because rather than passing the same cities dozens of times in his life, he had chosen to walk barefooted.

It was part of his compassion not to use vehicles, because all vehicles were pulled by horses or bullocks, and this was against his compassionate heart. It was violent. These animals should not be tortured. This is sheer exploitation of innocent animals; and man has done everything ugly to exploit them.

Have you seen the difference between a bull and a bullock? The bull has a grandeur, a beauty, a wildness, tremendous strength; but castrated, he becomes a bullock. You cannot make a bull pull a vehicle -- he is too strong and too wild. You will not be able to keep him on the road. He can run anywhere taking your whole vehicle and you, and you will not be able to do anything. He is one of the very powerful animals.

But castrated... castrating an animal is ugly. He becomes weak. He loses his sexual energy; that is the only energy all the animals, including man, have. It is something to be understood, that the bullock is a poor animal: you can do anything to the bullock. You have destroyed all his beauty and all his grandeur by destroying his sexual energy.

But that's what religions have been doing to the monks, to the nuns. In the name of celibacy -- it is just another way of turning bulls into bullocks, turning beautiful human beings into slaves.

And you must be made aware of the fact that not a single impotent person has been creative in the whole history of

man, in any direction. It is as if creativity is basically concerned with your sexuality. If celibacy is something spiritual, then the impotent person is absolutely celibate; but not a single impotent person has ever become enlightened, and it is a long history.

The impotent person has never become a great poet or a musician or a painter or a dancer or a sculptor. He has not been creative because sexual energy is your creative energy. It creates life -- that is only one natural way of using it. It creates everything else too, so it is not unnatural. On that point, all the religions have been angry with me -- that I say that all these enlightened people were more sexual than ordinary people. They have to be: they need more energy to reach to the highest peak of creativity, to explode into light, to give a new birth to themselves, to become a new man.

And we know perfectly well that all artists are more sexual, all creative painters are more sexual, all great novelists are more sexual. Poets, dancers, musicians -- any dimension of creativity is bound to be connected with your sexual energy. Impotent people have not been able to contribute anything to life.

Religions have been trying to castrate man in the name of celibacy, and that is one of the reasons that religious people have not been creative; otherwise for thousands of years your monasteries have existed, but nothing has come out of them. We have given the best men to the monasteries. Our most intelligent people, our geniuses have moved to the monasteries, but the monastery reduces them to non-creative people. They simply lose all power to create.

Buddha was against using animals, who cannot speak, who are absolutely innocent. And it is a beautiful experience to see them in their wildness when they are totally themselves, untouched by man's cruelty. He decided that he would move on foot. Naturally, that limited his scope.

All these people had difficulties in moving what I have called the wheel of truth. But they were not having such great difficulty as it has become today.

They had chosen small pieces of the world. Their work was intensive in those small pieces of the world; they managed. Now the world has become very small because of technology. You can move around the world without any difficulty and without torturing anybody.

I think if Buddha was alive I would convince him to use a car or to use an airplane, because that is not using any living being. But man's stupidity is such that Jaina monks, Buddhist monks, still continue the twenty-five-century-old idea of walking barefooted; barefooted because, in those days, all shoes were made of leather.

Now it is not necessary. I am using shoes of synthetic leather -- nobody needs to be killed. I have been telling Jaina monks, "You can start using synthetic leather." Mahavira was against shoes for the simple reason that the best leather is from calves -- the younger they are the softer is their leather. The older the animal... then you get leather which is not good. The best comes from the youngest animals, just born; you kill the child, then you get the best leather, the most comfortable and the most soft.

But now there is no need....

That's what I call stupidity: they won't listen to me; they don't have any argument. When synthetic leather is

available -- you can even make shoes of cloth; shoes of cloth are available, shoes of rubber are available. These are made absolutely nonviolently. In the same way, vehicles run by petrol are not torturing any animals.

But the old world was very big, and every enlightened master lived in a small corner. It was easy to move the wheel of dharma, or truth, in that small corner of the world. There were a few other things which helped to make it easy. One was that all these people came from royal families -- which helped immensely: they were not opposed. Even by enemies they were respected -- they were royal blood.

No blood is royal, all blood is the same. You can take "royal blood" and ordinary blood -- blood from a beggar -- and go to the lab and enquire which one is the royal blood; they will not be able to make any distinctions. Blood is blood. It has its own distinctions, but royalty does not enter into it.

But because all the Hindu incarnations, all the Jaina tirthankaras, Gautam Buddha -- all came from royal families... they were heirs apparent. They were going to be kings and they renounced; and they remained in their own kingdoms or around there. Although they had renounced, people still respected them as kings. And they became even more respected because they had renounced: they became almost gods.

Now royalty is disappearing, has almost disappeared. One of the heads of Egypt, Farouk, used to say that there are only five kings: one is of England and four are in the playing cards. That's all the royalty that has remained. And soon there will be only four -- the queens, the kings, will be

only in the playing cards. Even though there are a few, they have no power.
The new world is small. There is an international language which is understood by almost all the intellectuals of the world, the whole intelligentsia of the world.
So it is possible -- and that's why I say it is a great challenge, because nobody has had this opportunity before -- to move the wheel of truth throughout the whole world. All those old enlightened people were very local, but their difficulties were less. Now the difficulties are bound to be more.
They can prevent me from being in America for no reason at all. Against their own constitution, against their own law, they can force me illegally, criminally, to leave the country. They can destroy the commune, cruelly, primitively.
I have never entered Germany, and even before I even asked them for an entry visa, they made a law that I should not be allowed. They have been very precautionary.
In my own country, India, they want to cut me off from the whole world, because I am not preaching Hinduism, I am not preaching any other Indian religion; otherwise they would have been very happy.
One of the richest men in India, Jugal Kisore Birala, who is dead now, offered me unlimited help, a blank check, if I was ready to spread Hinduism in the world. I told that old man, "You must be mad! You cannot purchase me with blank checks -- I will go on doing what I am doing. And I am absolutely against all organized religions. I want religious people in the world but no religions. I want a religiousness -- a flavor, a fragrance -- but not Hinduism, Christianity, Judaism.

"There is no need for religion to be organized. Is there any need for love to be organized? Love is a personal affair. You don't have organizations for love.

"Religion is even more personal, because in love at least two persons are involved -- it is interpersonal. Religion is absolutely personal. Only you are involved and it is simply your business. Nobody has anything to say to you. Between you and existence nobody should stand as a mediator."

He was very angry. I said,"You can be angry -- that is your problem -- but you invited me for dinner; and then you insult me by telling me that you are going to give me as much money as I want but I should preach Hinduism. And that is the last thing that I can do, because Hinduism is one of the most rotten religions."

Because it is the most ancient, naturally it has got to be more rotten. Its very foundations are rotten, so it becomes difficult.

Hindu fanatics have made an attempt on my life. The same people who wanted me to be their ambassador-at-large, around the world, have tried to kill me. And now, when I came back to India, they informed all the Indian embassies around the world that nobody who is going to meet me or see me should be given an entry visa. No news media from the outside should be allowed to come to me. That's a way to stop me from spreading whatever I feel and experience to be the truth.

As the pope heard that I am coming to Italy, he immediately informed all news media that are Catholic and under his influence, that they must not even mention my name. They must not give me any publicity -- positive or negative.

So there are going to be difficulties. Everywhere the politicians will not like me to be there, because I am constantly speaking against the politicians, who have driven humanity to a point of global suicide -- and they are still doing it.

And all religions are agreed only on one point -- they disagree on everything but on one point they are in absolute agreement -- that I should be prevented, my work should be prevented, because it goes against their vested interests.

So it is more difficult to turn the wheel of truth today, but it is more exciting too, and more ecstatic too. And even though there are people trying to prevent my work, from five nations I have received an invitation: they would like me to be in their country as a permanent resident, and they are willing to give all the facilities that I need.

So it is not a state of hopelessness. If five countries can ask and invite me, that is enough to work with. Those five countries we can work with very easily and without any difficulty, because the governments themselves are welcoming me.

Secondly, I am going to choose one of those countries for my permanent residence. There will be all the facilities for sannyasins to come there, and we can use all the news media -- which were not available for Buddha or Jesus or Mohammed, and which are available to us. We can have our own satellite -- there is no need to go into every country. But the message they cannot prevent.

They will never allow me in the Soviet Union. They are persecuting my sannyasins there. I have never been there, but still I have hundreds of sannyasins in the Soviet Union,

and they are going through great trouble with the KGB and other government agencies.
Their books have been taken away, their tapes have been taken away, their videos have been taken away, and they are continually interrogated. Those agencies found at least two hundred sannyasins; they are not aware of more. They are torturing these two hundred to give them more names, more addresses: "Who are the others who are interested?" And they must be puzzled because I have never been there. But truth has its own way of working too. Now Russia is a very potential place, because they are tired of communism as no other country is tired of anything. For seventy years communism has been torturing them. And you cannot torture any country forever, for eternity; seventy years is more than enough. The time has almost come for the youth to rebel, and they are searching for something that can give them some indication of rebellion.
They have translated my books. They are writing them by hand or cyclostyling them or typing them underground and spreading them on their own.
So if there is some truth, it will have its way. Hindrances may delay it, but they cannot stop it.
The wheel is going to move.
It is only a question of waiting patiently, working patiently. All over the world there are sannyasins. There is not a single country where sannyasins are not -- even in Mohammedan countries where they cannot wear red or the mala or the locket because they will be immediately killed. Mohammedans are the most primitive people. Those sannyasins will not only be tortured, they will be simply

killed. They will not be asked, "Why are you doing this?" So I have told them that there is no need....

And they are spreading. They are getting tired of a very ordinary religion which cannot even be called religion. Just because of its numbers, Mohammedanism is second to Christianity, but it has nothing of religiousness in it.

The whole KORAN has been sent to me many times, that I should comment on it. And I have tried to look again and again, but I have not found anything in it that I can manage to comment on and say something good about. It is not even good literature. There is not a single statement which makes it spiritual, and there is so much rubbish and nonsense that should be eradicated -- but then nothing will be left.

And all kinds of stupidities are suggested in it -- that each Mohammedan can have four wives. In the first place religion has nothing to do with how many wives you should have or not. But prescribing four wives to every Mohammedan is such a stupid thing because women and men are equal in number; if Mohammedans start having four wives, then they will be depriving three men of having wives.

Those three men are not going to just sit silently and do nothing... and the grass grows by itself! They will do something. There will be all kinds of perversions, there will be prostitution. And once you allow four -- and Mohammed himself had nine wives -- that gives license to other Mohammedans who can afford it.

The Nizam of Hyderabad in India... it was a big state, Hyderabad, and just in this century -- when India became independent -- the king, the nizam, had five hundred wives.

He had five hundred wives because there is no limit: if Mohammed can have nine, and every Mohammedan is prescribed four.... And the nizam was a rich man -- perhaps he was the richest man in the world.

He had in his state the most precious quarries for diamonds. The Kohinoor comes from there, the diamond "Hope" comes from there; all the best diamonds have come from Hyderabad, and each diamond that comes out of those quarries reached first to the nizam. If he chose it, then it remained in the treasure; otherwise it was sold.

He had so many diamonds. I have seen his palace, it is one of the biggest palaces in India. There was no question of counting the diamonds, the whole basement of the palace was full of diamonds. Once each year they were brought out on the terrace of the palace, and spread out -- just to have some light. They were weighed; there was no way of counting them.

And I have been shown the terraces -- which were full when the diamonds were spread there. He had unestimated money in his hands. Of course, he could have five hundred wives -- there was no problem in it. And Mohammedanism has nothing to say about this, that it is ugly, inhuman; that you are treating women like cattle.

You can kill somebody -- according to Mohammedanism -- if he resists conversion. Because this the basic belief, that only Mohammedans will be saved. All the religions have the same basic belief, that only their people are going to be saved. It is okay if you just have the idea; but Mohammedans have the idea that because only Mohammedans can be saved, everybody has to be converted to Mohammedanism.

Even if you have to cut off the head of the person, it is better to do that rather than let him live as a non-Mohammedan -- because as a non-Mohammedan he will be doing things which will take him to hell. And strange promises -- the person who cuts off the head will be rewarded because he is bringing people onto the right path. And the person whose head is cut off will also be rewarded, compensated: he is saved from hell. So in every way it is perfectly right to kill people for conversion.

You will be surprised to know that India is the biggest Mohammedan country, because they have forced.... In almost fourteen hundred years of Mohammedan invasions, rule and slavery over India, they have converted so many Hindus. And anybody would be willing -- rather than dying it is better to live as a Mohammedan.

And when they were rulers, there was no question of finding any justice. They have destroyed India's greatest treasures of sculptures, because Mohammedanism is against all those sculptures. Mohammedanism is against statues, so every statue has to be destroyed, because God cannot be represented in any form -- and India had millions of temples with beautiful carvings and beautiful statues.

A few have remained because they were either far away in the forests, in the mountains, and Mohammedans never bothered to go there.... A few others have remained because people covered them with mud -- the whole temple. A few beautiful statues have remained because people sunk those statues in the wells. In almost every well you will find statues.

I have been to a city which must have been the city of the craftsmen, the sculptors -- only of sculptors and craftsmen,

because it has thousands of statues, and not a single living human being. Out of fear of Mohammedans those craftsmen escaped, leaving their incomplete statues or completed statues because they were too heavy to carry.
You will be surprised to know that in India we have one statue of Bahubali -- one of the Jaina masters -- fifty-two feet high. The whole mountain has been carved, because where can you find fifty-two feet in one piece of stone? So the statue has been carved in the mountain. It is still standing, rooted in the mountain.
It is so big that, from wherever you see it, you cannot see it proportionately. They have made a staircase going around the statue, so you can move and look at the statue from all sides. Even the smallest toe of the foot is the length of your whole body -- six feet. So when you are looking from below, you can't imagine how big the head is. You can see it but you cannot imagine how big the head is -- it is too far away from you.
But the people who did the work must have been of immense genius. Everything is absolutely proportionate. From the toes of the feet to the head, everything is in exact proportion. They must have been very perceptive and it must have taken hundreds of years for hundreds of artists to make it. Because it is standing in a faraway mountain it has survived, but there must have been others.
Thousands of statues are distorted, because once a statue is distorted then it is of no use for the Hindus or the Jainas or the Buddhists to worship it. It has to be perfect. Just cut off the nose or an ear and that's enough -- it is spoiled. Then they cannot worship it.

Mohammedanism is still in a very primitive stage. It knows no argument. Its argument is the sword.

I wanted to have a residence and a commune in Kashmir, because it is one of the most beautiful places in the world. But Indira Gandhi, who was immensely interested in me, suggested, "It is not right, you should not go to Kashmir. You will be killed. It is ninety percent Mohammedan." And she was a Kashmiri. She said, "I will not suggest it and I will not help you, because I know they cannot tolerate you for a single day."

They know only one thing, and that is the sword. They know no argument, they know no discussion. They have not come to that human stage where you can discuss problems and come to conclusions openheartedly -- discuss, not to prove anything but to discover the truth.

I have been informed from Catholic countries that they will be unable to receive me, even for a tour, because the pope is against me and they don't want to disturb the pope.

For almost twenty years I have not been in any Hindu conference in India because Hindus became very much afraid -- and that seems to be strange, particularly in Hinduism; a religion which has always been ready to discuss, which has a philosophical tradition.

But now it seems, because Christianity and Mohammedanism and communism -- which should be included in the religions, because it is just an atheist religion.... It has a trinity of Karl Marx, Engels, and Lenin, and it has a holy bible, DAS KAPITAL, and it believes as faithfully in the words of Marx as any Christian believes in the words of Jesus.

Marx is outdated as much as anybody else, although he is not very old. But in these hundred years there has been so much development in science and technology that Marx is absolutely out of date. For example, Marx proposes materialism as the base of communism and modern physics says there is no matter. Matter simply does not exist, it only appears to. That comes very close to the ancient Upanishadic approach to reality which says the world is just a dream. It is an appearance but not a reality.

Modern physics comes very close to the UPANISHADS -- it does not support Karl Marx, it goes absolutely against Karl Marx. But in Russia they go on teaching people -- from the kindergarten to the university -- materialism, materialistic communism. It is almost a religion.

And these three religions -- communism, Christianity and Islam -- are covering almost the whole earth. You cannot enter Russia, you cannot enter China, you cannot enter other communist countries; you cannot enter Mohammedan countries....

While I was coming back to India, I had to stay the whole night in Cyprus because Saudi Arabia would not allow me to fly over the country because it was some religious day. I said, "My flying over the sky has nothing to do with your religious day. You can celebrate, you can.... You must not be celebrating in the sky, you must be celebrating on the earth."

But no, nobody can pass over the country. And lately I have been informed, particularly because I was there in a chartered plane.... If somebody else had been there, they may have allowed them. I would have been flying thousands of feet above, but I had to wait for twelve hours

in Cyprus till their religious festival was over, and then they let me move.
So the world is full of crude, unintelligent, idiotic ideologies. It is difficult to turn the wheel of truth. But on the other hand, for the first time, the youth of the world is no longer interested in the past. It has lost its roots in the past. It has no respect for the past because it can see clearly that the past has been ugly, barbarous; and what man has done to man is intolerable.
And tomorrow this new mind, the new generation, is going to be powerful everywhere. This generation is open to the future, and there is every possibility that the new generation will be able to understand what I am saying without any difficulty.
So there is no need to be worried about the old generation. One of its legs is almost in the grave -- I just have to wait in Cyprus for twelve hours more and the whole old generation will have gone into the grave!
But the wheel is going to move.

Light on the Path

Chapter #34

Chapter title: To relate with non-sannyasins is bound to be difficult

8 February 1986 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1

BELOVED OSHO,

WHY IT IS SO DIFFICULT FOR SANNYASINS TO HAVE DEEP RELATIONSHIPS WITH NON-SANNYASINS?

It is natural.
To be a sannyasin means you are deprogrammed.
To relate with non-sannyasins is bound to be difficult because they are programmed people. Their programmed minds and your deprogrammed minds cannot have anything in common. You will think them stupid; they will think you licentious, rebellious.
There is no possibility of communication.
It will become more and more difficult the more sannyasins get deeper into meditation. Then those people will not be able to understand at all. They will think that you have been corrupted, you have been brainwashed, you have been hypnotized. All kinds of condemnation will come upon you from their side.
And from your side, you cannot conceive how people can go on believing in such stupid ideas. Everything they believe in will look idiotic -- their God, their heaven and hell, and their churches, their prayers.
You have become an outsider. You do not belong to the crowd. You have been able to see something of which they are not aware.
It is just like a man having eyes trying to communicate with a group which is blind. There will be a thousand and one difficulties. You cannot mention colors, you cannot mention light; you cannot mention a beautiful sunset, because they will start laughing: "You are living in fantasies -- these things don't exist."

And for you the problem is that you know they exist, and you know that these people are blind and they need some treatment for their eyes. But you cannot force them; they don't think they are blind. They simply think that this is how one has to be.

And they are in the majority. They may even violently force your eyes to be destroyed just to help you, so that you don't talk nonsense. You talk about colors and rainbows and flowers and sunsets and stars -- which are not part of their mind at all. But they are powerful. They are in the majority; they have the government in their hands -- they can do anything they want.

And you cannot do anything against them, nor would the heart of a sannyasin like to do anything against them -- you can only feel compassion for them. You can try to convince them, argue with them, but your arguments and your efforts to convince them are not going to lead you anywhere, because you are speaking two different languages.

It is one of the most difficult things, and it has always been so. Not only to sannyasins, but to all people of greater perceptivity, greater sensitivity, the masses have been antagonistic.

Vincent van Gogh... just a few days ago I saw a copy of one of his paintings in which he makes his stars like spirals. Nobody has painted stars like spirals -- you don't see them as spirals. He was condemned even by the painters of his day. All the critics were against him; all the painters thought that he was crazy. Every night you can see the stars, but have you ever seen spirals?

It was just a few months ago that astronomers came to realize that every star is a spiral. The distance is so much --

that's why we cannot see the spiral. But it is strange how Vincent van Gogh got the idea. He was not a physicist -- he had no instruments.

It took one hundred years for scientists to develop delicate instruments, sensitive instruments which can see stars as they actually are. But he had painted them a hundred years ago exactly as they are finding them now. Their photographs and Vincent van Gogh's paintings are exactly the same!

But the poor fellow was not understood at all. He was turned out of his home because his parents were poor, and they said, "We cannot afford to keep you. You are now grown up. We have given you all the education that we could manage -- now you can become a priest in a church. We cannot afford for you to be a painter."

His father was working in a coal mine; his parents were really poor, and you cannot say anything against them. And Vincent van Gogh's first works are just coal sketches -- but they are tremendously beautiful. Now even those coal sketches have a value of millions of dollars. But his parents would not give him money for paints, for canvases, and finally they had to turn him out.

One of his friends took pity on van Gogh and asked him to stay with him until he got some employment. And he fell in love with the sister of the friend -- just love at first sight. The first day in the house of the friend, he proposed to the girl. The girl simply laughed; they were more comfortably-off people -- better educated, middle class, higher than Vincent van Gogh and his family.

She could not believe that this poor beggar could even dare to ask her. Jokingly, she said, "Can you give me any proof

of your love? Can you put your hand on this candle?" -- it was burning by their side.

He said, "Yes!" and he kept his hand on the burning candle. His whole hand was burnt. The woman got frightened: this man seems to be mad also! She pulled his hand away, but he said, "Why are you pulling it away? Let me keep it there until you say yes."

The whole family gathered there. They pulled him away from the candle -- he had burned his hand for his whole life -- and he was turned out of the house the next day.

A man of great sensitivity -- but no woman was ready to love him, because he looked crazy. Nobody was buying his paintings, and still he went on painting. His brother was employed -- his younger brother -- and was sending van Gogh the exact amount of money so that he could have his food every day. Each week he would send money -- enough for one week only. And Vincent van Gogh would only eat four days in the week, and three days he would fast and purchase canvases and paints. And nobody was buying his paintings. People were simply laughing and saying, "He is simply mad! We have never seen such paintings. What is he doing?"

But it seems whatever he was doing is going to come true, slowly, slowly. If his vision of stars is now confirmed by physics, it is simply a miracle that with bare eyes, he could see that they are spirals. Nobody in the whole of history has even thought about it, so you cannot think that he borrowed the thought from somebody. Nobody has seen stars like that. And he could not prove anything; he simply went on saying, "This is how I see them." But everybody laughed,

because they also could see the stars but they didn't see spirals.

This tremendous sensitivity... but he was misunderstood everywhere. And finally. when he was only thirty-three, they drove him mad. Hungry, starving, and everybody laughing and condemning... not a single painting was sold. His brother tried to send a man with money and said, "At least purchase one painting. He will have the consolation that somebody has purchased one painting."

The man went -- he had no idea about painting. Van Gogh was so ecstatic that somebody had come finally to purchase a painting -- so he was showing him all his paintings. And the man said, "Don't waste my time -- any will do. This is the money."

You can understand how much van Gogh would have been shocked. He simply said, "That means this money has been given to you by my brother -- because you are not even looking at the paintings. I cannot sell any painting to you. These paintings are not for people who cannot understand them. And just tell my brother never to do such a thing to me -- it hurts more." And it was found actually that that was the case.

Van Gogh died without selling a single painting. Now only two hundred paintings have survived, and each painting is worth not less that one million dollars; each painting has a certain quality that has never been found in any other painting.

He became mad, but he continued to paint even while he was mad; in his madhouse he continued to paint. Even the paintings he has done in the madhouse are tremendously beautiful. Perhaps he was not mad; perhaps he was simply

forced by the medical profession and other painters to feel that he was doing mad things.

After one year he was released, because he was absolutely nonviolent; he created no trouble for anybody, he simply continued to paint. In fact he was not willing to leave because it was far easier in the hospital. The hospital was paying everything for his paintings, and he was getting food for seven days, so this was far easier than to be outside.

But they forced him; they said, "We don't think you are mad, and if you are mad then there is no way to cure you. You simply get out." Outside he could not manage and simply committed suicide. He wrote a letter to his brother in which he says, "What is the point of living in a world where nobody understands you? And there is no hope that anybody will ever understand me -- at least not in my life. It is better to withdraw."

So this is not only with sannyasins, it is an old story. People of immense qualities, but with a different perspective and different sensitivity than the ordinary mind has, have been tortured, and there has been no way to communicate.

All that the sannyasins can do, rather than arguing with those people, is accept whatever condemnation they have and still ask them, "Do you see that we are happier than you? Do you see that we love more than you? Can you see that we are more silent, more integrated than you? We may be brainwashed, hypnotized -- all your condemnations we accept." Just raise the question, "Are you more contented than we are? -- although we have nothing. Are you less worried than we are? -- although we don't have anything

that makes us not worry, and we have everything that would make you commit suicide."

Don't argue -- simply make it clear to them, "We are homeless, we don't have any money, we don't belong to any society, we have abandoned all the nations, all the religions. Still, we are happy. We don't know what is going to happen tomorrow, but today is enough. When tomorrow comes it will take care of itself."

Rather than intellectual arguments, existential comparison perhaps may help them. Perhaps they may start thinking about it, that there is some truth in it. And that is the only possible way to bring them closer. And once they are closer and open and ready to listen, then there is every possibility of communion.

First, you have to melt the ice -- and that is the biggest problem. Once the ice is melted, then things become easier. So first, accept all their condemnation rather than retaliating, arguing against it. That will not help. What is going to help is to just accept what they are saying, then make an existential comparison and tell them, "You can think about it, and if you feel that we have got something that you have not got, we are ready to share it with you."

And those people are in misery. They may be pretending they are not, but they are in misery, they are in suffering. If you can just make a question arise in their mind, so that they can look at their fake masks and can see their reality for a moment, they will be ready to listen to you.

There is no other way. You cannot force, you cannot argue, because on that ground the conflict cannot be resolved. It can be resolved only on existential grounds. And that's where many sannyasins miss the point.

If people say, "You are hypnotized," you start arguing, "We are not!" No, you should say, "It is possible; you may be right, we may be hypnotized. But what do you think: being in misery and not hypnotized, or being in bliss and being hypnotized -- what alternative will you choose? And what is wrong in being hypnotized? Have you ever been hypnotized? Do you know what it is? Have you ever experienced anything of it -- or just heard the word?"

There are millions of people who have just heard words, and they go on throwing those words around: hypnotism, mesmerism, brainwashing -- and they don't understand a thing they are saying.

So rather than arguing, you can say, "If you know about brainwashing, I am ready: brainwash me, so I can see what brainwashing is. If you know what hypnotism is, hypnotize me, so I can experience what hypnotism is."

Make one thing certainly clear to them: "You don't know -- you are simply throwing words about."

I was a student of a professor, and there was always conflict with him for the simple reason that he went on throwing words about and he did not know what they meant. I would insist, "You explain that word. And I will not be satisfied only by an intellectual explanation. I am ready -- brainwash me, hypnotize me, I am ready." But he was just throwing words about.

He reported to the vice-chancellor of that university that I was a continual trouble because I would contest each word, that he had to prove.... The vice-chancellor asked me to come to see him. The professor was present there -- I immediately understood what the problem was.

The vice-chancellor said to me, "Why do you create trouble?"
I said, "I don't create trouble. You just wait and see." I asked that professor -- he was a Bengali man, Professor Bhattacharya -- I asked, "Have you read the book written by Ouspensky, TRACTATUS LOGICO PHILOSOPHICUS?"
He said, "Yes! It is such a famous book. I loved it when I read it."
And I told the vice-chancellor, "Phone the library and enquire if there is any such book -- because I have simply made up the name of the book. There is a book TRACTATUS LOGICO PHILOSOPHICUS, but it is not written by P.D. Ouspensky, it is written by Ludwig Wittgenstein -- and this man has never seen the book. This is my whole problem in the class.
"Do you think I am creating trouble or is this man the trouble? Can't he be honest and say, `I have never heard of such a book'? But he cannot accept his ignorance -- about anything."
The vice-chancellor phoned to the librarian; the librarian said, "P.D. Ouspensky has never written such a book. There is a book of this name, but the author is Ludwig Wittgenstein."
The vice-chancellor said to the professor, "You have to understand that if you don't know, you should not pretend to know. And this boy has made his point absolutely clear."
I said to the vice-chancellor, "This has been happening almost every day. This man never goes to the library. I have looked through the whole philosophy department in the library: his name is not on a single book's card. And I

have looked in his house, because he lives by the side of one of my friends" -- who was a professor of economics -- "and the houses are joined together, they are sharing half and half. So I just made an arrangement with my friend, `Someday let me into his house. I want to see what books he has.'

"And all that he has are magazines like PLAYBOY, which I don't think have any philosophy. I have not seen a single book which is concerned with philosophy -- and he is a professor of philosophy! And do you think a professor of philosophy reading PLAYBOY is going to discuss philosophy with me? He has passed his examinations -- that must have been thirty years ago, but in thirty years philosophy has moved on further and further."

That was the last time that the professor allowed me in the class. The next day when I went into the class he said, "Listen, you may be right. Yesterday you put me in such a bad situation -- I don't want to argue at all. Either you promise me not to argue in the class or just don't come to my class."

I said, "I always wanted not to come to your class because it is so worthless. But you have to give me ninety percent attendance."

He said, "I will give you one hundred percent, but don't come to my class."

I said, "Can I come to your house sometime?"

He said, "I don't want to see your face!"

I said, "It is up to you: if you have decided to remain retarded, what can I do? But once in a while I will try to come to your house, because I want to help you to come out of your retardedness."

He was very angry with the economics professor: "You allowed him in my house to look into my books -- and certainly there are no books, just magazines and other things. He brought the whole thing before the vice-chancellor, and I felt so insulted!"

I went to the vice-chancellor and I said, "This is the situation: he is willing to give me hundred percent attendance, but he does not want me to attend the class. And I want to inform you that this is absolutely criminal. You go to the class and check how many days I have been present."

The vice-chancellor did it; he went to the class at the end of the month, and I was marked as present the whole month. He asked Bhattacharya, "Are you sure that this person has been present the whole month?"

Bhattacharya became suspicious that I must have been doing something behind his back. He said, "Yes, I am certain; otherwise why should I give him that percentage of attendance unless he was present?"

The vice-chancellor asked the students. They said, "No, we have not seen him for one month."

Bhattacharya came to my room in the hostel that evening and said, "Please, come to the class from tomorrow. I am very sorry, and I accept that I don't know anything about the latest developments in philosophy. But you have given me so much trouble that if you don't come to my class, I am going to lose my job."

I said, "Don't be worried -- I will not do any harm to you. I simply want you to understand that you should not throw names around. You go on throwing names around like Martin Heidegger, Jaspers -- you know nothing about these

people, and I have been wasting my whole nights with these people. You simply stop! What is the point? -- if you are not knowledgeable, accept it.

"I am trying to become knowledgeable, and I think it honorable of you to recognize that you DON'T know. I don't think there is any disrespect in it, because one cannot know everything in the whole world. There are millions of things, for everybody, that he does not know. So you learn one thing: when you don't know, you have to accept in the class that you don't know."

That discussion with him... I went to the class the next day and he really accepted three times in one hour that he did not know anything about something. And afterwards he thanked me, "It was such a great release and freedom to say, `I don't know.' I have never known such a relief. It was a tension and anguish to tell a lie, knowing perfectly well that I didn't know this man, this philosophy, and still saying I do -- because this was my conditioning, that the professor has to know everything, at least more than the student."

I said, "Forget that, and there is no problem" -- and since that day there was no problem. In fact, even in the class he would stop sometimes and ask me, "Perhaps you have some idea about this that you can explain to the class."

He had been a very disrespected person; he became a person very respected by the students -- just by accepting that he was ignorant about some things. His humbleness created respectability.

It is a difficult task with people, and you have to deal with different people in different ways. No certain method can be given, because it may work with one person, it may not

work with another person. So you have to be very watchful about the person to see what will work.
One thing is certain, that they are all in suffering, all in tension and anguish, and they all want to get out of it. So from there you have to find your clue, and the key. And if you are watchful enough, you can always find the clue and the key, and a communion is possible.
And you have nothing to lose. That person really wants to lose many things -- his misery, his suffering, his anguish. And he has nothing else; his whole being is full of hell.
Don't fight with the person. Try to accept whatever he is saying. Ask him questions about what he says and let him feel that he knows nothing about these things. Once he accepts his ignorance about anything, you have a loophole from where you can enter into his being.
His knowledge is a protection of his personality, his ego. So first you have to make a dent somewhere. So just listen to him and ask a few questions, and you will be able to find where he is just absolutely ignorant. Then you can make possible a little space to connect through. And let him feel your love, your compassion, your peace, your blissfulness. It will take a little time for him to ask you, "What has happened to you?" But sooner or later he is bound to ask, because he is sick, and nobody wants to remain sick. If you can prove that you have come out of the ordinary sickness of human beings...
Only then can a sannyasin have a communication with non-sannyasins.

Chapter #35

Chapter title: Beyond the mind is your reality
9 February 1986 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
DO WE NEED SPECIAL MEDITATIONS FOR WOMEN?

No. Meditation is concerned with your consciousness -- and consciousness is neither man nor woman. This is one of the fundamentals I want the world to be aware of.
All the religions have denied the woman any possibility for spiritual growth, thinking that her body is different, her biology is different: she will not be able to reach to the ultimate flowering of consciousness.
But it is strange that nobody down the centuries ever enquired: Who reaches the ultimate flowering -- the body, the mind or consciousness?
The body is different. If the body was going into meditation, then there would be certainly a need of different meditations for women than for men. Because the body is not involved in meditation, there is no question of any difference.
For example, in yoga, where the body is very important -- all the yoga postures are basically rooted in physiology -- there are many postures which are not suitable for a woman's body, and there are many which are more suitable for a woman's body than for a man's body. So yoga can make a distinction: yoga for men, yoga for women.

Mind is also different. Man thinks logically, linguistically. The woman is more affected by emotions, sentiments, which are nonverbal. That's why she tends to be not willing to argue. Rather, she would like to scream and fight, cry and weep. That's the way she has been for centuries, and she wins in it -- because the man simply feels embarrassed. He may be right logically, but the woman does not function logically.

So if meditation was concerned with mind, then too there would be a different kind of meditation for women than for men. But meditation is concerned with the very essential core of your being, which cannot be divided into male and female.

Consciousness is simply consciousness.

A mirror is a mirror.

It is not male, it is not female.

It simply reflects.

Consciousness is exactly like a mirror which reflects. And meditation is allowing your mirror to reflect, simply to reflect the mind in action, the body in action. It doesn't matter if the body is a man's or a woman's; it does not matter how the mind functions -- emotionally or logically. Whatever the case, the consciousness has simply to be alert to it. That alertness, that awareness, is meditation.

So there is no possibility of any difference in meditation between man and woman.

Question 2

BELOVED OSHO,

I AM SUCH A DOER. HOW CAN I BECOME MORE OPEN AND AVAILABLE TO YOU WITHOUT DOING?

HOW TO FIND THE BALANCE BETWEEN DOING AND NON-DOING, TO RECONCILE YOUR TWO STATEMENTS: "YOU HAVE TO ACT WITHOUT WILL," AND, "EFFORT IS ALSO NEEDED"?

It is a complicated question -- not existentially, but when you think about it, because the thinking part of the mind is the doer. It wants to do something, to make an effort. It is absolutely unable to understand that there is the opposite side of the mind which is non-doing, non-active, and already effortless.

The problem becomes more complicated because these two parts of the mind are not in any connection, in any communication. Nothing joins the split.

You are already doing many things, and also you are not doing many things. But both sections are so separate, so unbridgeably separate, that neither is aware of the other. The question comes from the section of the mind which finds it difficult to think of non-doing. Effort is perfectly good -- it is ready to do anything.

Gurdjieff based his whole approach on this half of the mind. It is an arduous effort, and it is not a coincidence that he became a very influential master in the West. He would not have been recognized in Far Eastern countries; he has no following in Far Eastern countries, where for centuries non-doing has been the basic approach. All his teaching was effort, actions.

J. Krishnamurti is more influential in the West than in the East. In the East, millions of people have not even heard his name. Even in India, where he was born, he visits only Delhi,

Bombay, Madras, which are the most Westernized parts of the country. And there too, if you look at his ideas, you can see who the people are.

In Bombay ninety percent of his listeners are Parsees -- who are not Indians -- and their religion is a religion of effort. In Delhi or Madras, everywhere he is listened to by intellectuals. It is the same part of the mind; and both Krishnamurti and Gurdjieff are denying the other part by different names.

Many women have been attracted to Gurdjieff, to Krishnamurti, not knowing that they are being attracted by the opposite. The attraction is of polarity. Not that they are convinced that Krishnamurti is right, or Gurdjieff is right: they function more from the non-doing part of the brain, and the non-doing part is immensely attracted to doers, thinkers. But it remains only an attraction; they cannot manage to do what these people are asking. Their attraction was basically from the opposite pole.

They would be in better company with Taoists, with Zen, but they may not be interested. I don't see many women interested in Zen or Taoism. Really Zen and Taoism are, in a way, feminine. They want you to relax and be inactive. What I am saying is that you are neither. My approach transcends Gurdjieff and J. Krishnamurti together.

Gurdjieff was more interested in physical efforts, hard labor, dancing, exercises. He was basing his action on the body. Krishnamurti is not interested in the body. He is interested in the activity of the mind, so his whole approach is simply logical, analytical. But you will be surprised that he himself personally has been practicing yoga his whole life.

And this is very strange -- he never teaches yoga, never even mentions it, because that is not his own ground. His own ground, his territory, is logical, analytical; it is thinking. He can create philosophers, not mystics. He himself is more of a philosopher, but he knows that yoga is significant. They are parts of the same hemisphere, so he has been practicing yoga -- but he is a sincere thinker.

He has had teachers in yoga. We had in Poona one of the best teachers of yoga, Iyengar, who has been traveling with J. Krishnamurti and teaching him yoga. He even approached me -- because he had been listening to me -- and he wanted to teach me yoga. And it is true that he is the best expert in India.

But I simply refused. I told him, "I have seen your books -- you are not doing right in saying that you are the master of J. Krishnamurti. It is true that he learns yoga from you, but you are not his master; you are simply a teacher. But proclaiming yourself as master of J. Krishnamurti has much bigger implications than just being a teacher of yoga.

"Somebody may be massaging him, somebody may be a physician to him, somebody may be taking care of his food -- that does not mean that they become masters! You are simply taking care of his body -- you should make it clear.

"And now you have approached me for the simple reason that now you can add this too to your propaganda, that you are my master. No one is my master -- and I am not interested in yoga at all." Krishnamurti is interested because yoga belongs to the same hemisphere of the mind. Physiological activity or mental activity -- activity as such is one part of the mind.

I cannot say that I belong to the traditions of Zen or Tao, although I love those traditions more than any other. But I cannot be part of their group because they are using the other side of the mind -- the inactive mind. Their whole effort is how to shift your consciousness, which is focused on action.

Naturally, in the world, action is needed, not inaction. For every success action is needed, not inaction. For all ambitions, action is needed. So the whole world, by and by, has become focused on the active part. But the active part is going to create tensions; it is going to create anguish, sadness. Even if you achieve your goal, you will find that you have not achieved anything -- you simply wasted your time and your energy.

The active part of your mind cannot leave you in a state of silence, relaxation, just at ease, at home. That is impossible for the active mind.

It is the inactive mind that can give you a home to rest in, and a shelter, and a beautiful feeling that nothing has to be done; that you are good as you are, that you are at the goal already, so you do not even have to move.

To change the focus from the active mind to the inactive mind, Zen had to use very strange methods, because the mind has been focused on action for centuries. It has forgotten completely how to move, how to be loose enough so that the focus can move to the other part of the mind.

So they will give koans -- which are absurdities -- to think about, just to tire your thinking; because thinking cannot come to any conclusion: there is no way. They are not puzzles -- puzzles can be figured out by the mind -- and they are not problems. There is no way to translate the

word koan because nothing like the koan has existed anywhere else.

A koan is a puzzle which cannot be solved; there is no way to solve it. It is a strategy to tire your active mind -- so much so that out of tiredness it falls flat; it recognizes its failure. In those moments the focus can be moved very easily. Because mind has failed, you can move towards no-mind.

Their whole teaching is no-mind, no-action -- and you are at ease, you feel immensely contented. You feel all the tensions gone. And nothing has happened; only your focus has been changed. All the tensions are waiting on the active side, all your desires are waiting on the active side. All your ego and motivations of the ego are waiting on the active side. It is just that you are no longer focused on that part. You have moved to the opposite part.

I like what Zen has done to humanity. It has looked absurd, it has looked insane to many people. Illogical certainly it is -- but it is not insane, it is not absurd. It may look mad, but in its madness there is a method: they are trying to loosen your focusing.

My effort is not to be bothered much about active mind or inactive mind, because basically they are mind. The active mind can give you misery, and the inactive mind can give you what the Japanese call satori -- a peaceful, silent, relaxed, contented feeling. But it still remains part of the mind. You have not moved from the mind to consciousness. You have changed the focus, but you have not become the focus.

So if the focus can be changed to inactive mind, it can be again changed to active mind. There is no problem -- it has just to become loose.

That's why Zen people come to the philosophy of "action in inaction," because now they are moving their focus: they can do things, and they can move the focus to the inactive mind. So action continues, but they go on changing continuously. It is just as in the day you work, and you make effort; and in the night you rest, and you go to sleep. They are not contradictions. The sleep simply gives you rest. Rest for what? Rest to work tomorrow again. And why are you working? To have a restful night. The whole day you work, so in the night you can rest; and the whole night you rest, so that in the day you can work. And this is how the wheel of the mind goes on moving: this is action in inaction.

What I am doing is totally different from what Gurdjieff and Krishnamurti and Zen are doing. My effort is to make you aware of something beyond mind which is being used as a focus, which is your reality.

This transcendence of the duality of the mind opens the doors to consciousness. And once you are aware that you are consciousness, then your action is minimized. Whatever is absolutely necessary and urgent, you do -- not a single bit more nor less. And whatever action you have done, you need a rest to recover your energies. So you allow the resting mind to refuel the active mind, but you are an outsider -- you are using a mechanism, you are no longer identified with it.

In different situations there will be different combinations of action and inaction. There may be times when much

more action is needed. You will do it, but you will not become the doer. You will make all the efforts, but you will remain absolutely detached.

Whether those efforts succeed or fail will not be your concern -- you made them fully, that's all. Now what happens depends on millions of things in the universe; it is not in your hands, so you don't bother about success or failure. Your only concern is that whatever you do, you do it fully.

And there may be times when you feel that the mechanism of your mind, the active part, is tired, exhausted; you can go for a long rest, not doing anything, not even speaking. But there is always a balance between the two because now you can see from the outside when the balance is there and when it is not there.

I have said that you have to become inactive, you have to become totally relaxed, and that it needs a certain effort; hence the question has arisen that there seems to be a contradiction. It is always your logic that brings contradictions. Life is very simple; there are no contradictions.

The inactive mind cannot give you total relaxation. It is really in partnership with the active mind. It is a tremendously beautiful mechanism that automatically goes on moving from action to inaction, from day to night, from waking to sleep, and keeps you healthy. But it is not total relaxation, it can only be partial relaxation, because the moment you are rejuvenated, you have to move to action. That is an autonomous process.

When I say that the movement has to happen as a transcendence, in the beginning you will need effort. Use

the active mind to make that effort -- because it is ready to make any kind of effort -- and use the inactive mind to give you a taste of what effortlessness is. It can only give you a taste, but this is the beginning of a revolution.

When I said you need effort to attain relaxation, meditation, consciousness, I simply mean that you have to use both the minds. And once you have learned to use both the minds... The transcendental consciousness in you is absolute relaxation. It is pure silence. It has no opposite to it.

This has to be the criterion whether you have reached the goal or not. If there is still something as its polar opposite, you have not reached; you are still in the duality. One can move from one duality to another duality; it does not make any change. One has to move from duality to non-duality, because non-duality is the ultimate.

The ultimate has no opposite to it. It is the final synthesis where all opposites have melted into one, when male and female have melted into one.

There is an ancient statue in India -- I had one in America... somebody had sent me a small replica of the statue. It is half man, half woman. It is symbolic. It is saying that as man you are half, as woman you are half: together you become one whole. But then there is no opposite to it.

So transcendence of mind is consciousness. But you have to use the mind because right now there is no other way, and the mind can be used perfectly. But don't use one side of the mind -- which is what I see Krishnamurti and Gurdjieff teaching: using one side of the mind. When you use one side of the mind, at the most you can emphasize the other side of the mind, but not transcend it. Transcendence needs both the minds.

Zen has been using the inactive mind and is based on a fallacy that the inactive mind is total relaxation. It is not. The inactive mind is in partnership with the active mind. It is simply a reservoir for the active mind. It simply goes on supplying energy for the active mind -- so it cannot be the ultimate.

That's why I used the word satori. Zen has reached, at the most, satori, and they have thought that this is the end. This is not so. This is not samadhi.

The meaning of the words is the same, but satori is just half the mind realizing its inactivity, silence, and thinking that it is the whole. Samadhi is a far higher word. The word sam, of which samadhi comes, means ultimate balance. Samadhi is above and beyond the duality of the two minds.

There is a certain similarity between satori and samadhi; hence the fallacy. Satori is just like a moon reflected in a calm and quiet water. It looks just like a moon, but just throw a small stone in the water, and your moon is split into thousands of fragments; each wave distorts it. It is not reality. But one can have a misunderstanding between the moon in the water and the moon in the sky.

Samadhi is the moon in the sky, and satori is the moon in the water. Satori is certainly the reflection of the same moon, but a reflection is not the reality. The inactive mind has that capacity, because it is relaxation, silence, no action, no disturbance. It is a calm pool of water; it can reflect the moon. The active mind cannot reflect it; it is too much in a turmoil -- the winds are strong and the water is disturbed.

So I say effort is needed in understanding these two sides of your mind; and effortlessness is needed to relax, not into

the other side of the mind but beyond both sides. But before you can go beyond, you have to understand clearly the two sides of the mind so you can make the distinction; otherwise the inactive side of the mind has deceived many people.

It looks almost like the real moon -- and you have never seen the real moon, so it is the real moon to you. Satori is only a reflection of samadhi. I have never said that because I don't want to disturb Zen people, because they are the best people around in the world. Although they are clinging to a reflection, at least the reflection is of the moon. Sooner or later they will become aware that it is a reflection: any small disturbance, and the reflection is distorted.

But the point has to be noted that neither side of the mind is your ultimate reality.

Krishnamurti and Gurdjieff are not even as close as Zen people, because they are still engaged with the active mind. Gurdjieff may come closer to the inactive mind because he exhausts the body and its energies in his exercises. Then naturally there is a change; the active mind feels emptied out. It needs the support of the inactive mind -- and that was the method of Gurdjieff: to force you to work to the point where suddenly you feel an onrush of energy. According to him... he thought it was coming from your second layer, the emergency layer, or from your third layer, your basic universal energy.

As I see it, it comes from your inactive mind, which is doing this every day. The more tired you are, the more you fall into a deep sleep. That falling into deep sleep relaxes your tired muscles, your body, your whole system. It lubricates it; it gives a rest period, and by the morning,

when life is again rising up, you are again full of energy. It is not coming from any emergency source or from any basic universal energy; it is simply coming from the inactive side of your mind -- which is continuously doing this.

And it is something to be understood, why it is said that kings, although they may be sleeping in marble palaces, have a pillow of thorns; they cannot sleep. The reason is not that they are kings; the reason is that they never exhaust the active mind, so the inactive mind is not needed. The active mind continues thinking planning, worrying -- all kinds of things, because it is not exhausted. It has still energy to go round and round.

It is said that kings go to sleep more healthy than when they wake up. They are very tired, because the mind goes on and on. It simply does not stop and allow the inactive mind to function, so they are of course more tired.

But the same thing happens after enlightenment. That is my experience, and that has been the experience of many other enlightened people in the world. If you have transcended both minds, whenever you find the active mind tired, suddenly you move to the transcendental; you don't move to the other side of the mind.

The transcendental mind, once known... whenever you get a small gap between your activities, you will be suddenly transported to the transcendental mind. And the transcendental mind cannot do the work of the inactive mind, because it is consciousness twenty-four hours a day, around the clock. It is never unconscious.

I myself have experienced that it is very difficult to move to the inactive mind, because the moment you are not doing

anything, your whole energy simply moves towards the transcendental.

So for years I have been sleeping fully awake. I hear all the doors in the hotel being closed and opened. I was going to say to Bhikku Oberoi when he comes back, "This is not the right architecture for a five-star hotel, that you have to hear every sound of every flush, you have to hear all the doors around being closed and opened. The whole night it goes on.

"The architecture should be more soundproof. It should be made in such a way that these sounds can't be heard, or the doors should be made in such a way that they don't make such a sound. Or the dividing walls should be made with something soundproof in between the bathrooms, so that you don't hear other bathrooms' flushings going on at any time of the night."

It was just a coincidence: I was staying in Patna in 1960 and I was suffering from a migraine. I had suffered from migraine since my enlightenment; I had never suffered before. And the migraine is in only half of the mind; it is the active part of the mind that has it. If the active mind loses contact with the inactive mind, then it goes on working but it has no time to rest.

Because I was staying in the house of a doctor... he was very concerned that this was a terrible migraine, and it was really very strong. I could not open my eyes, it was so painful.

The whole day I would simply lie down with a wet towel around my head. But it was not a help -- just to pass the time.... And it remained with me for twenty-one days

exactly when it came. And it came at least four times a year, so it was wasting too much time.

The doctor gave me some sleeping pills. He said, "At least in the night you will have a good sleep; otherwise this migraine continues twenty-four hours a day." Usually a migraine does not continue for twenty-four hours; ordinarily migraine starts at sunrise and disappears by sunset, because it is only in the active part. As you drop out of activity, and the world starts cooling down and you are preparing for sleep, the migraine disappears.

But that was not the case with me -- it continued for twenty-four hours -- so I said, "There is no harm in trying." And it really helped: I could sleep, after many years, for the first time. I don't actually know what the sleeping pills did chemically, but one thing I am certain about -- which the chemist may not know: it made it possible again for the active mind to be connected with the inactive mind.

I remained a watcher, something in me remained awake, but only a small flame of awakening; otherwise everything went into sleep. My feeling was that the sleeping pill helped to make a contact with the non-active mind, which I had lost completely.

Since then Devaraj has been trying again and again to stop my sleeping pills, but it simply creates so much pain and so much trouble, that finally after torturing me once for one month, then fifteen days, he again gets back to a sleeping pill. And my feeling is that he will never succeed. He can torture me as long as he wants -- because I always listen. To whatever you want I will listen and....

The day I came here he was again on the same trip; he tried again, thinking that perhaps.... He was hoping that when I

was in jail in America that it would be a good time... I may have forgotten about the sleeping pills. I was also thinking in the jail that this was a good time -- I could not get a sleeping pill, so perhaps.... But for years before I had not slept; and in those twelve days I did not sleep a single wink.

So here he tried for one month and tortured me, because it is not only sleep that I cannot get, with the sleep not happening my stomach gets disturbed, my breathing gets disturbed, my eyes start burning. And I don't think there is any possibility... because without any device to shift the active mind and its energies to the inactive mind, it simply moves to the transcendental consciousness. It simply slips there, bypasses the inactive mind.

So some effort is needed to become aware of these two sides of the mind, and once you have become aware of these two sides of the mind, then without any effort, just watching these two sides, a sudden quantum leap happens. Your whole consciousness is centered beyond the mind; and that beyondness is neither male nor female.

Krishnamurti has suffered from the same migraine for forty years. Perhaps he could be helped by something that helps him to sleep. But nobody may have thought about it. It was just this doctor who, feeling so much for me, said, "The whole day you are in trouble so much; at least for the night, take a good dose and go to sleep."

But the strange effect was that I went to sleep and the next morning there was no migraine. He was also surprised. This was strange; these were only sleeping pills, they were not meant for migraine. And for migraine I had taken all kinds of medicine -- nothing helped.

It has been a long time for Krishnamurti -- forty years -- to suffer from very strong migraine. And my feeling is that the reason is the same.

One Buddhist bhikshu from Sri Lanka was brought to me because he had not slept for three years, and he was going crazy; his head had become so heavy. They had tried everything, but nothing helped. Somebody gave them my address. He came to see me and stayed with me for three months.

I told him, "First you stop vipassana" -- the Buddhist meditation, which is the finest to keep you aware. "You first stop it for a few days." And then I inquired, "At what times have you been doing vipassana?"

He said, "At all times." And a bhikshu has all the time in the world -- he is not doing any business, he is not in any job. All the work he has to do is to go begging once a day, and that does not take more than half an hour. And once a week he has to give a sermon -- that's all that his work is. So he was doing vipassana even in the night. And he started doing it more when night came and sleep was not coming: "Why waste time? -- do more vipassana." But vipassana is a method that will not allow you any sleep. It is awareness, and if you continue to be aware, you block the active mind from moving, diving into the inactive mind.

So I told him, "First, for seven days you completely stop vipassana." And just within seven days he was sleeping perfectly well. Then I told him, "You can start vipassana with sunrise, and you have to stop vipassana before sunset. And let us see what happens." And that worked perfectly well.

Since then I have been suggesting to my people never to do vipassana at night.

But after enlightenment you cannot do anything. It is not a question of your doing anything -- before enlightenment you can change from doing something to not doing something, or doing something only at a certain period. But after enlightenment the awareness is simply there, and it remains there twenty-four hours a day.

It is a well-known fact that Buddha slept only three hours a night and I don't think he slept even three hours... he must have been resting. But there is a possibility he might have been sleeping, because the whole day he was traveling by foot.

He was doing so much work with the body -- this arduous work of walking continuously for miles every day for forty-two years. It is possible that it might have created a situation, even after enlightenment, in which the active mind was forced -- by his activity throughout the whole day -- to connect with the inactive mind.

The same is true about Mahavira. He slept very little, but he was also walking continuously.

Most of the enlightened people in the world have died almost immediately after enlightenment -- the shock is too much. The body may not be able to take it, unless the body is specially prepared to take it.

Buddha and Mahavira were both trained warriors. They had very strong bodies -- the bodies of fighters. They both became enlightened nearabout the age of forty, and remained alive for almost the same time again -- forty and forty-two years.

I can see only one reason that they managed to absorb the shock: their bodies were so strong. But the shock always leaves the body in a very delicate condition, and most people have died just when they became enlightened. Enlightenment and death almost came together. They became so awake, so full of light, that all their connections with the mind and the body were broken -- and particularly if their enlightenment happened after the age of thirty-five, when one starts declining.

If you take seventy as the average age at death, then at thirty-five you are at the peak, and after that you start declining. If people have become enlightened before thirty-five, then they have survived longer than others, because the body was younger, stronger, and it was not on the decline; it still had a potential to grow. They absorbed the shock, but the shock had shaken everything.

I was never sick before I became enlightened; I was perfectly healthy. People were jealous of my health. But after enlightenment, suddenly I found that the body had become so delicate that doing anything became impossible. Even going for a walk -- and I was running before that, four miles in the morning, four miles in the evening, running, jogging, swimming. I was doing all kinds of things.

You will be surprised to know that when I entered the university, I was doing so much exercise -- running, swimming, jogging and other exercises -- that a few other students became interested. They started following me, to go for a run.

I had never thought that there was any problem in it, but the man who owned all the restaurants and the mess at the university came to see me and said, "I will give you a

totally free pass as far as food is concerned, but please don't help these people to run and jog and swim, because I am going to be bankrupt!

"Before you came I had never seen people eating thirty-five chappattis at a time -- and your followers are doing that. At the most four chappattis are enough. But if everybody starts eating thirty-five chappattis at a time, seventy chappattis in a day, then I am finished -- you are killing me! I'll make it completely free -- whatever you want from the restaurant, from the cafeteria, from the mess. Everything is free, for two years while you are here you will not be charged at all, but please stop these people...!"

But after enlightenment, suddenly and very strangely, the body became absolutely weak. And it is almost unbelievable -- I could not believe it, my father's sister's family, who I was staying with, could not believe it. It was more of a surprise to them because they knew nothing about enlightenment. I suspected there was some connection but they had no idea what had happened: all the hairs on my chest became white, just in one night! And I was twenty-one!

I could not hide it -- because it is a hot country, India, and I used to only have on a wrap-around lunghi the whole day, so my chest was always naked. So everybody in the house became aware of this and was wondering what had happened. I said, "I myself am wondering what has happened." I knew that the body had certainly lost its stamina. It had become fragile, and I lost my sleep completely.

I have been asked again and again why Ramakrishna died of cancer. I know why he died of cancer: he must have

become absolutely vulnerable to any disease. And if it was only Ramakrishna we could think it was just an exception; but Maharshi Raman also died of cancer. That looks strange, that within one hundred years two enlightened people of the highest order died of cancer. Perhaps they lost all resistance to disease.

I can understand from my own situation, I lost all resistance to diseases. I had never suffered from what you call allergies. I loved perfume so much, and I had never suffered because of it. I had beautiful flowers in all my houses where I lived; and India has such flowers I think no other country has -- with great fragrance.

Cold countries cannot have that fragrance; for that, a hotter climate is needed. But too hot a climate is also not right because that destroys the flowers, so something in between.... And India has that kind of climate; it is not cold, it is not very hot.

There are plants, for example a certain flower, "queen of the night" -- you can have just one plant, and the whole house will be full of fragrance; and not only your own house, the neighboring houses too will be full of fragrance. And there are many other flowers -- champa, chameli, juhi -- which are immensely full of fragrance. I always had those flowers around me, and I never suffered from any allergy.

But after enlightenment I became so allergic that just the body-smell of somebody was enough to give me a cold, the sneezes; and the sneezes triggered something in my chest. I started coughing, and coughing triggered another process; I started having asthma attacks which were absolutely

unknown to me. I had never thought that these things would happen to me.

But I was aware of what was happening. My consciousness and my body had fallen apart; the connection became very loose. The body's resting became impossible, and when you have not rested for many days, then you become vulnerable to all kinds of infections. You are so tired, you cannot resist. And if for years you cannot have any rest, then naturally you lose all resistance.

Mahavira died -- something was wrong with his stomach. For six months he suffered very much from stomachache, no appetite, and he died because of the stomach. It may have been stomach cancer or something of which there was no idea at that time.

It is said that Buddha died of food poisoning. It may not be the right diagnosis of his death. One thing is certain, that he must have had a very fragile body, which was very prone to becoming sick at any time.

The scriptures don't talk about it because it doesn't look good. But the fact that one of the greatest kings, Bimbisar, offered Buddha his own personal physician to be continuously with him -- and for forty years the physician was with Buddha, twenty-four hours a day, wherever he was going -- is enough proof that there was something going wrong. Otherwise, what was the need of having a personal physician? And that too, not an ordinary physician -- Bimbisar's own physician.

And if Buddha was healthy -- because the scriptures don't mention any illness.... But they have forgotten that it can be logically concluded that if he was not sick, not always

prone to sickness, then why should a personal physician of an emperor follow him for forty years unnecessarily?

My feeling is that because enlightenment is the last lesson of life, there is nothing more to learn, you are unnecessarily hanging around. You have learnt the lesson -- that was the purpose of life -- so life starts losing contact with the person. And most of these people have died immediately; the shock was so much. And death is not a calamity to them; it is a blessing, because they have attained whatsoever life was to give.

But to live after enlightenment is really a difficult affair. The most important thing is that one loses contact with his inactive mind, and it becomes impossible to have any contact. The moment you are silent, immediately the energy moves to your transcendental awareness.

You are aware, even when you are doing something, saying something. The flame is not that strong, because your energy is involved in some activity. But when you are not doing anything, then suddenly the whole energy immediately shifts to the highest point. It is tremendously blissful, it is great ecstasy, but only for consciousness, not for the body.

Nobody has ever explained exactly what the situation is. I think there may have been a fear that if you explain it to people -- they are already not making any effort towards enlightenment -- and if you say it is possible that enlightenment may become your death, they may simply freak out! "Then why bother about enlightenment? Then we are good as we are -- at least we are alive! Miserable, but we are alive."

If your body becomes vulnerable, fragile, non-resistant to any kind of disease, that may also give them the argument: "This is not good; it is better not to bother about such things. It is better to be healthy and have no diseases, rather than having enlightenment and then suffer a fragile body and all its implications."
Perhaps that may have been the reason that it has never been talked about. But I want everything to be made clear. I don't want to leave anything about enlightenment, its process, as a secret.
It is good for people to know exactly what they are doing and what can be the result. If they do it consciously, knowingly, it will be far better. And those who are not going to make any effort, only they will find excuses; they were not going to make any effort anyway. For those of you who are going to make the effort -- even if death comes, it will be a challenge, an adventure, because you have attained whatever life could deliver to you, and then life slipped away.
Okay?...

What happened to your camera? Your eye is not blinking?

I COVERED IT BECAUSE I THOUGHT IT WOULD DISTURB YOU.

I thought it had become enlightened!

Light on the Path
Chapter #36

Chapter title: Enlightenment: the by-product of being in the present
11 February 1986 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
I AM A SOCIOLOGIST. THAT MEANS I DEAL SCIENTIFICALLY WITH THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL AND POLITICAL STRUCTURES, AND THE INDIVIDUAL. THOUGH I THINK THERE ARE SOCIOLOGICAL LAWS, AND THAT SOCIOLOGY CAN HELP US TO UNDERSTAND THE PROBLEMS OF SOCIETY BETTER, I AM MORE AND MORE IN DIFFICULTIES WITH SOCIOLOGY, IN THAT WAY OF THINKING, AND WITH THE SOCIOLOGISTS AS WELL.
IT HAS BEEN A PROCESS LIKE THAT SINCE I HAVE BEEN A SANNYASIN. I HAVE THE FEELING THAT I CAN'T STAND IT ANY LONGER AT THE UNIVERSITY. CAN YOU SAY SOMETHING ABOUT IT?

The whole so-called philosophy of sociology is very superficial, for the simple reason that society does not exist. What exists is the individual.
Sociology begins from the wrong end. It starts studying social relationships amongst the societies, amongst individuals. But they never bother about studying the individual -- who is the source of all the relationships, of all

the societies, of all the cultures that have happened or ever will happen.

Society has no soul. What can you study in it? It is almost as if somebody is studying Rotary Clubs. A Rotary Club has no soul, it is just a club where people meet. But the reality belongs to the people.

And up to now sociology has not yet become a science. It pretends to be a science -- it is not, for the simple reason that it has not started from the right point. The right point is the individual. There seems to be some fear about beginning with the individual, because there are millions of individuals in the world, and every individual is unique. It seems easier to take them as a whole and just study from the outside how the whole functions.

If it were a mechanical thing, the sociologist would have succeeded. But it is not a mechanical thing. It is not that the individuals are parts of the society. Society has no existence apart from the individuals. It is just in the individuals living together, relating together, that the society is created.

The fear of studying the individual should be dropped, because although there are millions of individuals and they are all unique, their basic consciousness is the same, and the principles of the functioning of that consciousness are the same. Either the consciousness is awake -- then a person functions like a Gautam Buddha -- or the consciousness is asleep; then the function of the person is similar all around the world. What you do in your sleep does not matter much; your sleep is the same.

It will certainly be difficult to study a Buddha, because he has attained an awakened uniqueness, and each Buddha is

bound to respond differently, because his action is not a reaction. His action is purely action. You cannot make him do something; it is his spontaneity which is decisive.
Secondly, he is not logically a consistent person. He does not owe anything to logic: logic has not given him anything. Whatever he has attained, he has attained by dropping logic, by dropping thinking. He functions out of his state of no-mind; hence he is unpredictable.
And every science wants a subject to be predictable; otherwise what is the point of the science? The whole purpose of the science is to predict, and to predict accurately, a hundred percent; there is not even a possibility of any exception. And each awakened human being is an exception -- there is no rule.
The sleeping people... howsoever different they may be, in their sleep all their differences disappear. A man may be a painter, a poet, a scientist, or he may have other talents which make him different from other people -- but they are all asleep. The asleep man is predictable because he knows nothing of response; he only reacts. You do something, and he will react -- which can be predicted.
So sociology has a basic difficulty, and that is, it has to be divided into two parts: the first part should be studying the reactions, the relationships of the sleeping humanity. And there will not be any difficulty in making a science out of it. Every sleepy person is going to be jealous, is going to be full of hatred, is going to make every effort to monopolize, is going to be competitive, is going to suffer from an inferiority complex -- or a superiority complex, which is just the other side of the coin.

His life is almost the same, down the centuries, around the world. Cultures are different, religions are different, civilizations are different, but the sleep is simply sleep. It does not matter whether you are asleep in the nineteenth century or in the twentieth century; your reactions will be coming out of your sleep, which does not know anything of time, of change.

So the first part of sociology is not going to be difficult. But it is not the true part. It is the false humanity that you are trying to study.

The true part is of those few awakened individuals whom you will have to study separately. There is no way to make a category of them: in every way they are unique. And you should not mix them in with the sleepy people; then it becomes a mess. Then things become more complicated.

It is better to divide sociology into two parts. One that belongs to the people who are asleep -- and that is a very simple job. The second is the difficult job, but not impossible. You can study the awakened people -- although they are few. The first part will remain static; the second part will remain growing, because the more you will study new awakened people, the more light, the more dimensions will open up.

To avoid these difficulties, sociology has chosen not to study the individual but to study the whole group, its mechanism. This is a simple device to avoid the difficulties, but it is not going to lead to the truth, and it is not going to make it a science.

So I can understand the difficulty of a person who becomes a sannyasin, and who is a trained sociologist, who teaches

in the university. Now he will be finding difficulties in which he is not clearly aware what is happening.

The first difficulty is that he can no longer say that sociology is a science, because he is aware of exceptions -- the awakened people -- not only one but many. Secondly, he cannot accept the idea of studying society as a whole from the outside, because that is a futile effort.

Society is not an organism. The individual is an organism -- alive; and you can study only the alive, and how the alive organism reacts or responds. Because sociology has not done any of these things up to now, and the sannyasin must be becoming aware that the whole thing seems to be wrong... I can understand him very clearly, because to feel one way and then to teach exactly the opposite of it becomes a heavy load. He knows that what he is saying is wrong; still he has to teach it according to the syllabus of the university if he wants to remain a teacher in the university.

The same has been the situation with me. I was teaching religion, philosophy, logic, psychology; and with every subject there was trouble because it was not in tune with my own vision and insight. I struggled, for nine years continuously, to manage somehow -- and I found a way to manage it.

The way was that first I would teach them what the syllabus prescribed. So every period was divided into two parts: half of the period I would teach them what the prescribed books said about religion, and the other half of the period I would condemn it and criticize it and tell them, "This is what I say, and I feel. Now it is up to you to decide: if you want to pass, listen to the first part; if you

want to fail, listen to the second part. I am not responsible -- I am making it clear to you. It is just that I don't want to carry the burden on myself that I am teaching something which is absolutely absurd to me."

I would teach them about philosophers with whom I do not agree -- so half the time for the philosopher and half the time for my disagreement. Now the students were getting very confused, and naturally they were agreeing with the second part because the first part was only in a dead book: I was alive and I was present, and I was destroying the whole structure that was in the dead book.

And their problem was that whatever I was saying they also felt was right, but they could not write it in their examination, because the people who would be examining them would be looking for the first part; the second part was not written anywhere.

So they were getting confused: "You have found a way not to be burdened, not to feel guilt that you are teaching something which you know is wrong. So it is good for you -- but what about us? Now we will be writing something that we know is not right, and we cannot write that which we think is right."

It was a great struggle for nine years continually. Finally I thought it better to leave the university because it was creating unnecessary conflict in the minds of the students. And many who were the best failed, because they did not write what the books say; they argued according to me. But their examination copies were going to old and respected professors from different universities who had no insight, who simply looked for a repetition, an accurate repetition of the book.

So the best students were failing, and the third-rate ones were passing, because for the third-rate there was no question of conscience. It was not a question of truth; the question was how to pass. So whatever helped to pass, they were writing; and whatever prevented it, they were not writing.

They were not really interested. They were not seekers, they had just come to get a degree. Why be bothered? But the best who had really come as seekers... it was painful to me and hurting me.

I argued with the vice-chancellor, "These students should not fail. I want to look at their copies." And I showed the vice-chancellor that their answers were absolutely right, although they were against the books.

"But books don't have a monopoly. And the books were written fifty years ago, and in fifty years do you think everything has stopped, gone dead? that a full stop came when this book was written? In fifty years so much has happened in the world of philosophy, more than had ever happened in almost five thousand years previously. If you weigh five thousand years of philosophical thinking, and the last fifty years of contribution, these fifty years will still be weightier."

He agreed with me, but he said, "What can I do about it? The examiners have failed them. And it is not a question of one student, it is a question of many students."

So I said, "Then the only way is that I should leave the university, that I should start teaching what to me is true."

And this is the situation of the sannyasin. It is better he leaves the university. It will become a bigger and bigger

burden. The more he understands, the more difficult it will be.

For example, I never could say to my students that psychology is a science. It is not. To become a science there is no possibility of having so many schools. Then there will be a single truth about any problem; not that Freud has one answer and Adler has another and Jung has another and Assagioli has another. What kind of science is this? But every book of psychology pretends that psychology is a science, because science has prestige: to declare it scientific is to declare it true.

So the best way for the sannyasin is to get out of the university. His university is now the whole universe. And he should not teach anything that goes against his conscience, because the conscience is so valuable that it cannot be sold for anything. A job, a good salary, a respectable position, does not matter. And he should make it clear why he is resigning -- because the subject is not a science and it is pretending to be a science, and he doesn't want to pretend anything.

The subject is basically wrong; it starts with society -- which does not exist -- and it avoids the individual, who really exists. It avoids the individual because to accept the individual as the source of study, sooner or later one will have to encounter people like Gautam Buddha, Bodhidharma.... And that will be a totally different world. Whatever the sociologist has found amongst the sleepy people will be contradicted absolutely by looking at a buddha.

So either sociology should be divided into two parts, or sociology should become two subjects: sociology of the

awakened man, and sociology of the sleeping man. "And if it is not going to happen then I am not going to commit a crime against my own understanding and self." The sannyasin should make it clear to the university and to the news media.
Perhaps there are other sociologists who are thinking in the same terms but have not been able to put it together, what their problem is. He may be able to create a movement which someday brings about an authentic sociology.

Question 2
BELOVED OSHO,
BEFORE I CAME TO KNOW YOU, I HAD NEVER HEARD ABOUT ENLIGHTENMENT. BUT I WAS SEARCHING FOR SOMETHING. NOW, AFTER FOUR YEARS OF LIVING IN A COMMUNE, I FEEL FURTHER AWAY FROM REACHING SOMEWHERE THAN EVER BEFORE. I'M JUST GRATEFUL TO BE HERE AND TO FEEL YOUR FRIENDSHIP AND COMPASSION. IS ENLIGHTENMENT STILL THE GOAL? IS THERE ANY GOAL AT ALL?

This is a troublesome question.
Enlightenment has never been the goal. Its very nature prohibits making it a goal. The goal is always in the future somewhere; and enlightenment is always now and here. Enlightenment is an experience in the present.
But this is one of the troubles of the mind, that it makes goals out of everything. If you love the idea of enlightenment, then immediately the mechanism of the

mind makes it a goal: you have to achieve it -- and that's where you go on the wrong path.

Enlightenment is a by-product of the understanding that to live in the past is foolish, because it is simply memory. But millions of people are wasting their time in memories. Millions of others are living in the future. You cannot live in the future; it is making castles in the air.

To understand that past and future are both nonexistential... all that you have got is a very small moment: this very moment. You don't even get two moments together. When one moment is gone, you get another moment. You always have only one moment in your hands; and it is so small and so fleeting, that if you are thinking of the past and the future, you will miss it. And that is the only life and the only reality there is.

Understanding this whole process, one thing becomes certain: why the mind avoids the present, which is the real, and why it tries to get involved with past and future, which are not real. As one tries to understand that, one thing becomes clear: that in the present moment, mind cannot exist.

Mind is simply a collection of memories of the past, and -- out of those memories -- imagination about the future.

Mind does not know three tenses.

It knows only two: past and future.

Present is nonexistential to the mind. The existential is nonexistential to the mind; and the nonexistentials are existential to the mind. Hence the whole effort is how to get out of the mind, how to get out of the nonexistentials and to stand in the middle -- where existence is.

How to be in the present? -- that is the whole knack of meditation. And the moment you are in the present, enlightenment is its by-product.

Don't give it to the mind -- the mind will immediately make it a goal. Mind cannot do anything else. It cannot put it in the past because you have never experienced it, so the past is closed. You have yet to experience it; naturally, it has to be put somewhere in the future. And it always happens in the present.

So forget about enlightenment. It is a by-product; you cannot do anything about it. This is the beauty of by-products: you have to do something else, and the by-product comes in. You have to learn to be in the present more and more. In other words: you have to learn to be in a state of no-mind more and more.

It was for a certain reason that mystics called meditation "no-mind": if you call it meditation, again the mind makes a goal out of it. Then you have to achieve meditation. So it makes no difference whether the goal is enlightenment or meditation, the goal remains, the future remains, and goes on destroying the present.

The mystics time changed from meditation to no-mind for the first time had a tremendous insight. Now no-mind cannot be made a goal: mind cannot make it a goal. It is simply absurd -- how can mind make a goal of no-mind? It will simply say it is not possible; mind is all, there is no no-mind.

This was a strategy not to allow you to make it a goal. Very few people have understood the strategy, that that's why they have called it no-mind -- to prevent the mind from making it a goal.

So be more and more in a state of no-mind. Just go on removing memories, imagination, to clean and clear the present moment. And as it deepens, as you become more and more capable of no-mind, enlightenment comes of its own accord.

Enlightenment is simply recognizing your being, recognizing the eternity of your being, recognizing that there has been no death before, nor is there any death to come -- that death is a fiction. Seeing your being in its utter nakedness, in its absolute beauty, its grandeur, its silence, its blissfulness, its ecstasy -- all that is involved in the word "enlightenment."

Once you have experienced that juice, mind starts losing its grip on you because you have found something which is qualitatively so high, so fulfilling, such a tremendous contentment, that mind feels its function is finished. It looks ugly, because it has only given you misery, worries, anxiety. What has been its contribution to you? Its grip loosens; it starts hiding in the shadows, and by and by it falls away.

You continue to live, but now your living is moment to moment; and what you have got as a by-product in that small gap of no-mind goes on growing. There is no end to that growth.

Enlightenment only begins, it never ends.

Nobody has said this before. They have all said that it is perfect -- but perfection means it cannot grow. It has happened once, and all growth, all evolution, is finished. But as far as my experience is concerned, I can say very authoritatively that anything that you are stuck with

permanently cannot remain ecstatic, cannot remain blissful. You will start taking it for granted.

It was ecstatic because you had lived in agony; compared to that agony it was ecstatic. You have lived in pain, in wounds; against that, it was contentment, fulfillment. But now, day after day, month after month, year after year, life after life, you have forgotten agony, the taste of pain. And with that forgetfulness, your enlightenment will become just ordinary -- something that you take for granted, dull and dead. The ecstasy is the same but you cannot feel it the same. There has come a full stop, and life knows no full stop.

But why have all these mystics insisted that it is perfect? -- because they were afraid. Logically they were not able to face the philosophers, the critics... because if you say it is imperfect, that means something more has to happen. You have not attained the goal -- something is still missing. So it is partial, what you have attained. If it is not perfect, it is partial.

To avoid calling it partial, they said that it is perfect. But they forgot that some day somebody can raise a question against perfection. It has not been raised yet, but I am raising it: perfection is going to be dead, it cannot be living, because nothing is going to happen. It will be the same tomorrow and the day after tomorrow, for eternity.

You will get utterly bored with your ecstasy, with your contentment, and there is no going back. You cannot find that agony again, those moments of misery again, because all that has fallen out of your being. There is no way back, and in the future, for as far as you can see, it will remain the same.

I deny perfection. Enlightenment appears perfect because nothing seems to be missing at the moment. All that you have ever dreamed -- it is much more than that. All that you could have ever conceived -- it is much more than that. So it appears absolute, perfect, ultimate; but this is a fallacy. It will grow, it will become vast. New qualities will be added to it; and each time it is going to be a surprise because you have never thought about this quality.

So I want it to be clearly understood by my people, that enlightenment is only a beginning, the beginning of tremendous evolution, that has no limits. Only then can you remain dancing, singing. And you can remain thrilled every moment, because one never knows what the next moment is going to bring -- new insights, new visions, new experiences.

And there is no limitation to it. There never comes a point when you can say the journey has ended. The journey only begins, it never ends.

Other mystics have not said it because they were afraid that if you say to people that the journey only begins and never ends, they will never begin it. What is the point of a journey that begins and never ends? Then do something else. Why waste your life in such a journey, where nowhere you will find a place where you can say, "I have come home"?

But I want to be absolutely truthful about enlightenment. And I want it to be an excitement that it does not end. It is not something against it, it is something favorable about it -- that everything goes on expanding, everything goes on growing, everything goes on getting higher; and still the infinite sky is there, the infinite universe is there.

And if the universe can be infinite, which is inconceivable for the mind... you cannot conceive the universe as infinite. Mind cannot conceive infinity, for the simple reason that mind functions through logic. It will say, "It may be far away, but somewhere it has to end. How can it go on and on and on? We may never reach the end, we may never find the boundary line where the universe ends -- that is possible because we are limited -- but that does not mean that the universe is unlimited."

Logic cannot conceive it, thinking cannot have any justification for it. And if you start thinking, you cannot believe it. You can push on the boundary as far as you can but the boundary remains.

But the truth is, the boundary cannot be there, because a boundary always needs two things: one on this side and one on the other side. You cannot make a boundary with only one side. You have a fence around your house because there is a neighbor's house. Your fence is not the end -- it is simply the beginning of another house.

So if sometime logic forces you to conclude there must be a boundary, it has to be asked: What will be beyond the boundary? There must be something. Even though it is going to be nothing, that nothing will also be part of the universe. Why are you creating a boundary? That emptiness will also be the universe.

Once you understand that every boundary needs two things -- something that it closes and something that it opens -- then you can have some idea that a finite universe is impossible. Only an infinite universe is possible.

But for the infinite universe you need an infinity of growth, because if you come to a point where you think you have become perfect, you fall out of tune with the universe.
The same logic has to be understood about evolution. It has to be forever and forever -- because again there is the question of a boundary.
You cannot make any boundaries in existence.
Boundaries do not belong to reality.
One of my professors, Doctor S.S. Roy, had written a doctoral thesis on Bradley and Shankara -- both are absolutists, both believe in perfection. And his doctoral thesis was accepted, he got the Ph.D.
But I told him, "You may have got the Ph.D., but if I had been one of the examiners of your thesis, you would not have got it, because Shankara and Bradley are preaching -- and you are trying to make a comparative study, that they are saying the same thing -- that there is a boundary at perfection. And you are saying it with so much emphasis that it seems you also believe in it."
He said, "Yes, I have been studying Shankara and Bradley my whole life, and they have left an immense impact on me. They both are the greatest philosophers in the world."
But I said, "They are just childish, that both believe there is a boundary at perfection. Then there is no growth possible. Perfection is death and life is growth."
And I asked him directly, "Would you like to be perfect and dead, or imperfect and alive? That is the choice."
He said, "I have never thought about it -- that perfection means death, and imperfection means growth. But when you say it, it sounds correct."

And I said, "You just think: For how long has existence been there? It has not yet reached perfection. Growth has not stopped, evolution has not stopped, and existence has been for eternity. So what reason can there be to think that tomorrow it will be perfect?
"The whole of eternity in the past has failed to make it perfect. What reason is there to think that just one day more is needed, or a few days, or a few years? We are always in the middle." I told him, "We are always in the middle. We will never know the beginning because there has never been one, and we will never know the end because there is not going to be any."
We are always in the middle, growing. It is eternal growth, in all the dimensions.
And the same applies to enlightenment.

Question 3
BELOVED OSHO,
A GERMAN WRITER, HANS-HENNY JAHN SAID ONCE: "DREAMS ARE THE BLOOD OF THE SOUL." CAN YOU SAY SOMETHING ABOUT THIS STATEMENT?

It is just a poetic statement. It is beautiful -- "Dreams are the blood of the soul." But only in poetry. It is saying that the soul is always hoping, projecting, dreaming -- it is never contented. But as I said, it is only true and beautiful as poetry, but not as a statement of truth.
Then I would like to say: Dreams are the blood of the mind. The soul has no dreams, the soul has no hopes. It is the mind.

Perhaps he is confused between mind and soul. If he puts "mind" in place of "the soul," it becomes a statement of truth, because mind's whole life-blood is in dreams, in the future.
But the soul is in the present. It cannot dream. Much happens to it in the future, but it is not that it dreams about it. It is always a surprise -- unexpected, undreamed of.
So as poetry I can forgive it, but as a statement of truth it is simply stupid!

Light on the Path

Chapter #37
Chapter title: I don't have any disciples, i have only friends
12 February 1986 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
FRITJOF CAPRA, IN AN INTERVIEW WITH SWAMI DEVA OJAS ABOUT THE NATURE OF SPIRITUAL ORGANIZATIONS, SAID, "THE COSMOS DOES NOT KNOW ANY HIERARCHY," THAT "THE BEST WAY TO ORGANIZE THEM IS AS A NETWORK, IN A LOOSE INTERACTION," AND THAT "SUCH A NETWORK STRUCTURE SEEMS THE BEST SOIL FOR THE SPIRITUAL GROWTH OF THE INDIVIDUAL, BECAUSE IT ENSURES THE POSSIBILITY OF THE INDIVIDUAL CONTINUING AND GUARANTEES ENOUGH TO DEVELOP HUMAN RELATIONS."
PLEASE COMMENT.

He is right, and that's what we are trying to do.
Nature certainly has no hierarchy. Hierarchy is man's mind game, because without a hierarchy, the ego cannot feel nourished, it dies.
In nature, everything has an opportunity, space, and there is nobody is being bossy. Nobody is master and nobody is servant. Nature functions almost as an organic unity in which individuality is not lost, but in which the ego has no chance to evolve; hence trees don't have egos, birds don't have egos. Animals of all kinds don't have egos.
The problem arises with man. He can't think without putting someone above him and below him. The mind is very comparative. It is the comparison that creates a hierarchy.
To destroy the hierarchy we have basically to destroy the comparative spirit. We should see each individual as individual -- incomparable.
And that's what I am trying to do. Sannyasins should become more and more individuals, having a direct relationship to me, having a friendship with other sannyasins. That's how it will be a network. But nobody is higher and nobody is lower. This way will help to avoid organization and all its bureaucratic spirit. And it will give individuals freedom, space to grow on their own,
But the trouble is double-sided. Individuals don't want to have that much freedom. So many questions have been coming, and they all indicate that people are afraid to dissolve communes, because with freedom comes responsibility.

People love freedom -- but nobody wants responsibility. And they come together, they are inseparable.

Because people don't want responsibility, they want to live in a commune where responsibility is taken by the commune. But they don't understand that the moment responsibility is taken by the commune, individuality is also taken; they are inseparable.

They will find a certain feeling of being at ease in the commune, but they will not grow. It will not help for their spiritual development, because they have lost the basic growth by losing individuality, by losing responsibility. They are safer, secure -- but dull and dead. They always look up to somebody else to tell them what to do, what not to do.

So organizations have not been imposed by people. It is impossible for a single pope to impose his will on six hundred million people. Something is in those six hundred million people which needs a pope, so they can feel that they are no longer responsible; the whole responsibility is on the representative of God -- and, finally, on God. They created God just to get rid of responsibility, unaware of the fact that the moment you lose responsibility, you lose yourself; you become a cog in the wheel.

My insistence that there is no God is basically to give back responsibility to you. Without God there is no Jesus Christ as a savior, there is no pope to tell you what is right and what is wrong. There is nobody who decides on your behalf.

In the beginning it may feel like a tremendous burden, but to get out of retardedness and to become mature, one has to take that burden. It is not against you; under the pressure of

responsibility your whole individuality is saved. But without denying God, organizations cannot be denied, because God is the beginning of all hierarchies. And God is not part of nature because nature knows no hierarchy.
So from every angle God does not exist. But man wants him to exist. It helps him to get rid of the whole burden and just be a retarded child. And for centuries he has lived in that state: there was God, and there were God's messiahs and their representatives -- and man was simply to listen, to follow. If he cannot follow, then he just has to go and confess the sin, and he is forgiven. So it was a very much easier way.
But growth is a little harder. To accept that you are alone, that nobody is above you who can decide for you, that you have to take decisions every moment of your life, that every inch you move is your decision.... If you commit a mistake, you have to correct it; nobody can forgive you, because there is nobody at all. If you do something good, nobody is going to reward you.
So basically and deeply the acceptance that "my act is my reward, and my act is my punishment, and I am totally responsible for whatever I am doing" -- this is maturity.
You are not in need of a father figure.
You are not in need of being part of a crowd.
You can be yourself.
I wanted the communes not to be hierarchical -- but it seems difficult, because every man wants a hierarchy. So the only way is to disperse people, and let them be on their own and work towards their spiritual growth. In the beginning it may look hard, but in the end it is immensely

beautiful because then you become part of a non-hierarchical cosmos.

In a hierarchy you will remain always bounded by human crowds; you will never get out of them. You will not be part with the trees, with the rivers, with the mountains, with the stars -- because they don't understand the language of hierarchy.

So once you have passed the initial shock, things become very simple -- more simple than they ever were in a hierarchical system -- because it is not only responsibility that is coming to you, freedom is also coming to you.

Just to think of yourself as totally free and totally responsible for each act -- there is no judgment, no court, no God, no boss over you -- makes such an immense space available in which to grow.

And then sooner or later you will realize that you are becoming part of a non-hierarchical existence, because existence understands freedom, it understands responsibility, but it has no way to understand hierarchy.

A loose network is perfectly good, just to inform each other: if some help is needed somewhere, it can be given -- but the network should be very loose.

It will not make you a crowd. Individuals will have space enough. And there is nobody who is a pope or an Ayatollah Khomeini or a shankaracharya. Each point in the network is independent. If he is in the network, it is his choice, his responsibility. If he wants to get out of the network, there is no barrier and there is no guilt.

Capra's understanding is perfectly right.

Question 2

BELOVED OSHO,
GURDJIEFF SAID THAT A MASTER HAS THREE KINDS OF DISCIPLES: THOSE WHO ARE HELPFUL TO THEMSELVES, THOSE WHO ARE HELPFUL TO HIM AS THE MASTER, AND THOSE WHO ARE HELPFUL TO THE GROUP. IDEALLY, THE DISCIPLE WOULD FLOWER IN ALL THREE DIRECTIONS. OSHO, WHAT KIND OF DISCIPLES DO YOU HAVE?

I don't have any kind of disciples.
It is perfectly good for Gurdjieff because his method requires a dictatorial master who knows -- and the disciples, who know not. And then he divides disciples in three groups: one who help themselves; one who help themselves and help the master; and the third who help the group.
In a school method that division is necessary; all those kinds of disciples are necessary. The master is alone, the group is big, so all developed group members in a certain way become part of the master. So those who are developed start helping the master in his work; he cannot work alone. But still there are disciples who cannot see beyond themselves; they help only themselves. And the third is the group who helps the group because the master needs the group to be together in a solid unity, with no factions.
In a way it is some kind of spiritual fascism.
But I don't have any disciples. I have only friends. I don't need anybody's help. If they give, it is their joy. It is not my need; it is their gratitude. I want simply to give indications of the path, and each one has to follow the path.

And the path is not something ready-made and available. That is the most important thing to be understood. The path is created as you walk: just by your walking a footpath is created, but there is no footpath ahead of you.

The master's function in my work is just to be loving, helpful, compassionate in times when you are discouraged and you need fresh inspiration, in moments when you feel lost and you need a reaffirmation, in moments where trust is shaken and you need to be again given roots.

The master is simply like a gardener. His joy is to see all his plants come to flowering.

There is no question of certain people helping the group -- not as a category. There may be a few people who will help the group because they love the master, they love the work, and they would like the work to spread. But I will not categorize them; on the contrary, I will say that each sannyasin functions in all these three ways at different times as the need arises.

Sometimes he is working on himself, which is his basic work. Sometimes he is helping the master, out of gratitude; sometimes he is helping the group, out of love -- because they are fellow travelers. But these are not three categories of people, fixed. These are three qualities in every disciple, as far as my work is concerned.

It is not dictatorial.

You are with me because you love me.

People were with Gurdjieff, not because they loved him -- most of them hated him from their very guts -- they were with him because they knew that this was the only man who could help them to grow. Their basic motive was their own growth.

The people who are around me may have come, in the beginning, with the motivation of their own growth; soon that motivation drops away. Then they are with me because they love me -- and in love growth happens so quietly, so silently, without making any noise. It does not need any motivation.

My work and Gurdjieff's work are totally different. I have immense respect for Gurdjieff -- he did much work to introduce Sufi methods to the West, which nobody else had done before. Sufi books were translated -- but books cannot help. It needs a living master to give life to those words and methods. And the people who were translating the books had no idea of the work. Their translations were literal, and their translations reflected their minds more than the minds of the Sufis who had written those treatises.

For example, Omar Khayyam's RUBAIYAT... Fitzgerald has done a great job in a sense that he made Omar Khayyam world famous. In Persian he is not a first-grade poet; there are many greater poets than Omar Khayyam. He was not basically a poet, he was basically a mathematician. But he was a Sufi master, and he found it easy to express his Sufism in poetry. Of course, in mathematics it cannot be expressed.

And this is not only so with Omar Khayyam; many mystics have found that poetry comes very close to expressing what they want to express. But their poetry is only a means -- they are not poets. For a poet, poetry is not a means but the end; and that is a great difference. They use the poetic formulation to express their ideas, which are more difficult to express in prose.

But Fitzgerald absolutely misunderstood him: he took him literally. If Omar Khayyam talks about wine and women, Fitzgerald took it literally. And in a way, he misrepresented Omar Khayyam, but he helped thousands of people to enjoy the beautiful poetry.

Fitzgerald is a poet, so he managed the original Omar Khayyam in a better, more poetic way. Reading the original you are not impressed by the poetry, it is negligible. It is just a substitute for prose -- a little better than prose, but not the heights of poetry. That was not the purpose at all. But Fitzgerald, out of misunderstanding, has created great poetry. He was a great poet himself.

And then the misunderstanding of the Sufi symbols created a strange phenomenon. The saki -- the woman who pours the wine into your cup -- is God in Sufi language. And the wine that is poured is spiritual experience -- it is intoxicating; hence it has a similarity to wine.

These poets have never conceived of God as man -- always as a beautiful woman; and their whole approach is to be lovers of that woman. When you think of God as father, things become more flat -- and what kind of relationship can you have with a father?

In millions of houses the sons and fathers don't see eye to eye. They don't talk to each other unless it becomes absolutely urgent. The father is always afraid that if he says something, the son is going to argue against it. The father is aware of the gap -- he knows the son will not understand what he is saying; it is better to keep quiet.

And the son is also aware that the communication is broken. So only when he needs money or something that the father can give him, does he come to the father;

otherwise they avoid each other. They try not to come in contact in the house. When the father is out, the son will come in; when the father comes in, the son will escape. It is better, because otherwise there is an ugly argument which leaves a very sour taste behind.

There is a book by Turgenev, FATHERS AND SONS, which is all about this whole generation gap that nobody understands. Fathers have their own world, sons have their own world.

To call God "the father" does not ring a bell in your heart. That's why Sufis are absolutely against calling God a father. They are less against calling God a mother, because between the mother and the son there is still no generation gap, there is some understanding.

The understanding has some psychological reasons: the son always wanted to be a lover to his own mother. And that can show you why he feels so against the father. From the very childhood the father has been taking his beloved -- the mother -- from him. The father is the enemy.

All the societies all over the world enforce a certain respect towards the father. Remember, whenever a society insists that you should be respectful to your father, that means there is a fear that if it is not insisted upon, there is going to be disrespect; otherwise there is no question of insisting. If it is a natural phenomenon, then why so much insistence that you should respect the father, you should obey the father -- otherwise you are falling from your duty and obligations?

Perhaps from the very beginning, people became aware that there is competition between the son and the father, that there is competition between the daughter and the mother.

But the Sufis are not satisfied with calling God a mother either -- although it is better than father -- because they know that you cannot be a lover to a mother. You can love your mother but you cannot be a lover. And slowly, slowly it becomes formal; you have to love her because she is your mother. If she was not your mother you may not have even taken note of her.

Their choice seems to be perfect -- that God is your beloved, and you have fallen in love with the beloved. But their symbols were not understood by Fitzgerald at all. He never enquired of the Sufis, "What do you mean?" He simply knew Persian as a language, and he was a poet in his own right. And when he came across Omar Khayyam, he was thrilled.

Fitzgerald's translation is far more poetic than the original. You can't hope for mathematicians to be poets. So it is a very strange situation: it is all wrong, because he is taking it literally, that it is a man/woman love affair; it becomes something human. But he raises it to the most beautiful poetic expression. The original is symbolic, and he takes symbols as realities.

So many books have been translated -- Hafiz has been translated, Omar Khayyam has been translated -- but nothing has helped as far as spiritual growth is concerned. Gurdjieff is the first man who, as a master, brings Sufi methods. But Sufism has come out of Mohammedanism -- it is an offshoot -- and Mohammedanism is a very dictatorial religion. Sufism has changed all the symbols, but some shadow of Mohammedanism continues to hang over it.

So Gurdjieff's school is more or less a dictatorial school. On small things he was dictatorial. Every evening disciples would gather. He was a great cook, and he used to collect from the whole of the East different kinds of food, spices, which those people had never tasted in their lives. He himself would cook, and then he would start feeding the disciples -- every evening. He would force them to eat more and more; and you could not refuse, because it was not just a dinner, it was a school work. He changed everything into work.

If he was saying, "Eat more," then there must be something to it. Unless people started vomiting, he would go on forcing them. And there is some basic idea that if you want a man to be truthful, stretch him to the very extreme -- either fasting or feasting. Many religions have used fasting; he used feasting. It is the same: it stretches one to the very extreme.

The fasting man, when he comes almost close to death, suddenly realizes a few things which he had never realized. And when a man goes on eating and is so full that he cannot contain the food, and starts vomiting, he realizes for the first time something which he had never known. It is known only at the extreme.

And after the food there would be wine, and again the same enforced order: "Drink as much as you can." Gurdjieff would go on filling people's cups: "Go on drinking!" And people would be saying, "This is too much; we are losing consciousness" -- but he wouldn't listen.

By the middle of the night almost all the disciples were flat on the ground, saying things, uttering words, shouting, screaming. Very educated people -- professors, doctors,

artists -- behaving in such a crude, animalistic way, you could not believe it. And Gurdjieff would be sitting and watching each one.

From those moments he would get a clue as to what this man needed. It was simpler than Freud's method of years of psychoanalysis. This was far simpler -- because a master cannot work that way, that for years one student goes on, every day, taking up one hour, telling his stupid dreams while the master listens. And then he figures out, after years of listening, what is hiding in the man's unconscious.

Gurdjieff's method was so simple: just let a person drink and come to a point where he loses all consciousness, and the unconscious starts speaking. In a single session he was able to derive conclusions which Freud was not able to in ten years -- because the unconscious immediately takes over. And Gurdjieff would provoke people to talk in that state.

That was his basic understanding about the person, and it would be followed up: what kind of technique had to be given, what kind of person the man was. If he was an independent type, like the first kind of disciple, then methods would be given that he could do himself; there would be no need of any help from somebody. He could not work in a group -- he was too individualistic.

Then there were people, Gurdjieff found, who were absolutely incapable of working on their own, they needed a group -- only in a group could they function. And he found people who could be a great help to the groups, or people who could be a great help to him.

All the sorting was done out of their unconscious statements. If the statements were absolutely indicative that

the person already had a developed consciousness, he could be a help to the master. He could go on growing himself, but he was far higher than others -- he could be a help. And the master cannot work on so many people.

Gurdjieff had schools in England, in America, in France, in Constantinople, and underground disciples in Russia. So he needed people to be sent, but these people needed to be on a higher level. Of course they would not be the same as the master, but they would be better than the other disciples. They would be at least capable of helping them a few steps; then the master could take over.

There were people who showed tremendous compassion in their unconsciousness. These were the people who could help the group. If they did not help anybody, they would suffer; their compassion would remain repressed. Compassion needs a certain expression. And there were people who were utterly independent. Even in their unconscious their statements were absolutely of their own. Each statement had their own signature. Even in unconsciousness they could not forget who they were. Now, these people did not need a group, they needed individual methods.

So Gurdjieff had all kinds of methods -- what to give and to whom. And the ways he used to find... psychologists should be ashamed. There is no need to waste somebody's ten years and your ten years digging a whole mountain, just to find a small rat. Meaningless... it can be found in one night, it comes out itself. And everybody, in unconsciousness, behaves differently, so these three categories are found through the unconscious.

But my work is a totally different. In the first place, it is not the work of a school. In the second place, it is not dictatorial.

Work has to be dictatorial if you cannot explain it to people; and there is something in which Gurdjieff is handicapped -- he is not articulate. He cannot say exactly what he wants to say. He would write something, and then the disciples would read it -- and he would watch the disciples to see whether they were understanding or not understanding. Then he would write it again. One book would take almost twenty years to be written.

Gurdjieff was not certain that he had been able to say what he wanted to say, because he had been brought up in Sufi schools where no teaching as such is available -- only methods. You simply do the method and you will get it; there is no need to talk about it. So he was absolutely handicapped as far as explanations were concerned. He could not explain anything that he was doing, or for what reason he was doing it. He was doing the right things, but he could not prove that they were right.

Gurdjieff was not a philosopher, he was not a rationalist, not a logician. That's why P.D. Ouspensky -- who was a mathematician, a philosopher, a logician -- became his best spokesman. Even though he went against Gurdjieff, his books are the best introduction to Gurdjieff because he is articulate. Ouspensky did not know what Gurdjieff was saying, but once Gurdjieff gave him an indication of what had to be said, then Ouspensky could figure out the best way to say it.

As far as I know, in this century Ouspensky was the most articulate man. His every sentence is so pregnant, so full of

meaning and so clear; being a mathematician he could not be unclear. He does not write in paragraphs, he simply writes in single lines, because each line has such an independence and is so complete in itself that it does not need to be explained in a paragraph.

He is one of the best writers the world has ever known, although after writing these books -- A NEW MODEL OF THE UNIVERSE, IN SEARCH OF THE MIRACULOUS, and THE FOURTH WAY, all of which are devoted to George Gurdjieff -- he disconnected himself from Gurdjieff.

And one can see what happened. After THE FOURTH WAY, Ouspensky could not write anything significant. He wrote one book, THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THE FUTURE MAN, but it is ordinary, no comparison with IN SEARCH OF THE MIRACULOUS, and THE FOURTH WAY -- they are giants.

What happened to him? Those ideas were not his. He was only articulate, intelligent enough to put them forth in the right order; but those ideas were coming from Gurdjieff -- and he was absolutely inarticulate. You read a hundred pages and you may come across one sentence that seems to be meaningful. Perhaps he wanted to write just that one sentence, but he had to go round and round to find the right words for it.

Nobody reads Gurdjieff's books, for the simple reason that it is such a torture to read them. You have to read a hundred pages of sheer nonsense and then you may find it, or you may miss because of your anger. You may find it if you are calm and quiet and patient. Gurdjieff has written books -- one-thousand-page books -- but such patience is needed. So

even today Gurdjieff can only be understood through Ouspensky.

But he was a great explorer of methods, and he knew most of the secrets of the Sufis. He learned those methods, and he could teach those methods. But he could not explain those methods, exactly what they did and why they did it.

My situation is totally different.

Whatever I say to you, I know exactly why I am saying it, what it can do to you. what its basic purpose is, and the essential change that it can bring to your life.

I don't need any interpretation. I don't need any P.D. Ouspensky. I don't need any help, because whatever I am saying I have not learned from anybody. I have evolved it with myself through lives, so I know every nook and corner of it. I have not suddenly got hold of it. I am absolutely aware of how it begins and where it leads and what the pitfalls are. And I can make you aware.

And everybody can work individually; there is no need... because I have worked individually. I have never taken anybody's help, I have never accepted disciplehood from anybody. I simply moved on my own, knowing perfectly well it might take a long time, it might take a long journey; perhaps I might be moving in the wrong direction and I may never arrive. But something in me never wanted to follow anybody -- I wanted to discover it myself. Only then would I be contented that I had come to the truth.

So because it has been my own individual growth, whatever I can give to you needs no group; you can work individually. That's why it is easy for me to call you my friends, because I am creating in you the same desire -- to move alone, to go alone, to risk, and not to be dependent.

Discovering something on your own has an ecstasy of its own, which no follower of Gurdjieff, or anybody else, can have -- there is no adventure, there is no search.
My experience is that the adventure and the search does not only bring you to the truth finally; the very adventure and the search create in you a maturity which never comes to a follower.
He may come to the truth, but he will come to the truth retarded. He will not come to it as a fully mature person.

Light on the Path
Chapter #38
Chapter title: Music will remind you of me
13 February 1986 am in Kathmandu, Nepal

Question 1
BELOVED OSHO,
WHY DO I ALLOW HABIT TO DOMINATE CONSCIOUSNESS?

Almost everybody does it, unless one becomes enlightened. The habit is the easier way to do a thing. The whole mechanism of a habit is that you need not be conscious about it. It has become a mechanical part of you, a part of your robot mind: it does things by itself. You can go on thinking other things, dreaming other dreams, and the habit takes every action to its end -- with more perfection because a habit is mechanical, and machines don't commit mistakes.

So everybody is dominated by habit. And it is one of the most important things, to get out of this domination. It is moving from mechanicalness to consciousness.

In the beginning it is very arduous. You are doing one thing, and at the same time you have to remain conscious -- so you are divided. Because of your division, your action may not be as perfect as when the habit does it alone; it simply knows how to do it.

For example, if you learn bicycling, in the beginning it is very difficult, for the simple reason that you are too conscious, and there are many things to be conscious of. You have to take care of the handles, where they are moving, the direction. You have to take care of your legs, whether they are working on the pedals. You have to take care whether there are people on the road, cars or trucks. There are so many things to take care of, and you don't have any habit.

So, many times you will fall down, but as it becomes more and more habitual... it is called the transfer from consciousness to the mechanical part of your being. It is being done every day: the conscious mind learns a thing and then delivers it to the mechanical mind; then the conscious mind is free again, and the mechanical mind goes on doing all the things.

This is a natural way to make things simple, but as far as your growth of consciousness is concerned, it is against you. It is efficient, in tune with nature, but not in tune with a higher nature -- that is the cosmos, the conscious cosmos, where every action has to be conscious.

So try anything that has become mechanical: do it consciously. You will have difficulties because the result

may not be so good. Don't be worried about the result -- your concern is that whatever is done, is done with alertness. The action will take a longer time, but it will be more graceful.

Work first on one habit until you have changed the habit back to the conscious mind; and then there is a tremendous joy. Then work on another habit. Once you have started working on different habits, after working on a few habits, it will become easier and easier to change them back to the conscious mind, from where they have all originated.

Once a man's whole life becomes conscious, there is nothing more to be achieved. There is no repentance possible because whatever he has done, he has done fully consciously. There is no question of looking back.

Memories are part of the mechanical mind. The mechanical mind accumulates memories the same way the computer accumulates memories, because the computer will have to do those same things again and again; it has to accumulate memories.

As all the habits are transferred back to consciousness, you will be suddenly freed from the past; there is no question of carrying any memories. If you want, you can remember something consciously, but memories cannot float in your mind on their own, without your permission -- or even against you.

And this is the intricate relationship: the past memories create the future. No one knows anything about the future; everybody knows about the past. In the past you have experienced things; you would like to experience them even better in the future. That's how you create the future and future desire.

The more the past is there, the more you have to project into the future -- and between the past and the future you miss all that is real.

It is immensely important that you get rid of the bondage of the past. Simultaneously the future also disappears because it was only a projection of past memories -- and you are left only with the present.

Consciousness is always of the present.

And because you are not in the present, you have to delegate actions to your robot. And mind is a robot. People go on doing things, and doing perfectly well, and that makes them feel as if everything is going right. But every machine does it. It is better to commit a few errors, a few mistakes, but be conscious.

Humanity begins when you are finished with habits. Even if you have done the same thing many times, you always do it as if it is something new, with the excitement of the new, with the adventure of the new. And the excitement and the adventure fills each of your moments with tremendous blissfulness. Start from a small habit.

There is a Zen story of a master who had a small boy attendant. The master had a continuous way... while speaking there would be moments when he would become silent and point his finger. It was always the old message: the finger is pointing to the moon. Whenever he came to a point where words could not do anything, he would be silent, just pointing his finger. He would not even say, "The finger is pointing to the moon" -- he would just make the gesture.

It had become a joke amongst the disciples, not understanding what he was doing. The disciples, discussing

in the restaurant or other places, sometimes would stop somebody and point a finger, and they would all laugh about it.

The boy attendant was always there -- he had also become accustomed to the finger. He used to stand behind the master in case he needed him, and sometimes he would play a joke on the master. When people were listening to the master very seriously, from behind, the boy would just point his finger up -- and everybody would start laughing. The master was puzzled, "I have not said anything that makes you laugh -- what is the matter?" Finally, looking at their eyes, he found that it was the boy who was doing all the tricks; at any time he could do it.

The next day the master appeared with a knife, and as the boy pointed his finger, he called him, "Come before me and do it!" Because the master was ordering, the boy raised his finger -- and the master cut it off with the knife and then said, "Now do it again!"

The people were shocked, the disciples were shocked: this was too much! The boy had lost a finger -- blood was coming out -- and the master was asking him, "Do it again!" And in that moment of intense pain the boy's mind had already stopped working; he had never expected that this will happen.

Whenever something absolutely unexpected happens, the mind simply has no way to function; it is not prepared for it. But in his silence, the boy could see that he had been foolish, and he could understand for the first time that it is not the finger that matters -- it can be cut off -- what matters is the moon.

The boy, it is said, became enlightened in that very moment, fell to the feet of the master and thanked him. Many disciples could not understand it at all. First, cutting off the finger looked too violent, too inhuman. Secondly, the boy falling at his feet and saying, "I am grateful. I was not expecting... I was not here for enlightenment either, I was just a servant, but you have done a miracle. My whole being is silent. The pain is there, but I am only a witness."

Start with very small habits; just don't do them habitually. Don't take complicated habits. And when you are working on small habits, change to something about which the mind is not programmed; then the mind cannot continue the habit. Do it in some other way for which the mind is not prepared. You will have to be conscious to do it.

Everything can be done in many different ways. For example, you have always been writing with the right hand; try to write with the left hand. You will be immensely conscious because you have never done it, and the mind has no idea of how to do it. And the left hand is joined with a different side of the mind, which is not aware. It is not in communication with the side of the mind with which the right hand is connected, so there is no question of communication. You just write with the left hand.

You will have to be conscious -- there is no other way to do it. And you will be surprised: the handwriting is different, writing is difficult; you make spelling mistakes.... Strange, because you have never made spelling mistakes before. The writing is not beautiful -- you are writing like a child who starts from scratch. This will give you a chance to be conscious about writing.

And this time don't give it to the robot -- you write everything consciously, slowly, gracefully. And when you have succeeded in doing it, then move to the right hand; with the same consciousness start writing.

And this way it can be done. About every habit you can find some way in which you have never done it before. It will increase your intensity, increase your consciousness and diminish the mechanical part. Finally the robot will end -- and freedom from the robot mind is freedom to grow.

Machines cannot grow:

Only consciousness can expand and grow.

In Zen they have been giving koans to their disciples. That is just to break their habits. Those koans are absurd. "The sound of one hand clapping" -- it is simply absurd, illogical; it doesn't happen. But why have they been insistent on it? -- because the mechanical mind is absolutely incapable of conceiving it; it becomes dumb and gives a chance for consciousness to arise.

If it was two hands making a sound, the mechanical mind would be perfectly capable: it has done it, it knows the way. The whole purpose of the koan is to take your freedom back from mechanical habit. So, strange kinds of koans have been developed.

And that's why I say that Zen has reached perhaps to the most refined point of religiousness. Their methodology, their work, is no longer theological; it is absolutely grounded in your psychology and its transformation.

So choose any habit and start; and then go on changing habits and releasing your consciousness from that involvement. For a few days you will have a little haphazard, confused state of mind. But that is only in the

transition period when lifelong habits are going to be destroyed, and whatever consciousness has become implicated with them is going to be released. But it is tremendously worthwhile.
Habit is easy -- consciousness is difficult, but only in the beginning. Once all habits are gone, consciousness is far easier and far more enjoyable.
You start doing things -- each thing that you do becomes some new venture. In the world of habits it is all repetition. In the world of consciousness there is no repetition.

Question 2
BELOVED OSHO,
YOU SAID THE OTHER DAY THAT EVERY DISCIPLE WANTS HIS MASTER TO BE THE BEST MASTER IN THE WORLD, SO HE CAN BE THE BEST DISCIPLE IN THE WORLD. BUT YOU ARE THE BEST MASTER IN THE WORLD -- WHAT CAN WE DO ABOUT IT?

You cannot do anything about it -- nor can I do anything about it!

Question 3
BELOVED OSHO,
WHEN I'M NOT NEAR YOU PHYSICALLY, MUSIC SEEMS TO BE THE EASIEST WAY TO FEEL YOUR LOVE. SOMETIMES, LISTENING TO CLASSICAL MUSIC, IT TOUCHES ME SO DEEPLY THAT THERE COMES A MOMENT WHEN I FEEL I CANNOT TAKE IN MORE JOY. SUDDENLY I REMEMBER YOU, AND

ALL THE EXCITEMENT FALLS INTO A GREATER DEPTH, MORE CALM, SILENT, SOOTHING. NOW THERE IS NO MORE BOUNDARY TO JOY... AND SO MUCH GRATITUDE.
PLEASE COMMENT.

The first thing to understand is that music is a by-product of meditation.
The first musicians, the pioneers, were really not trying to create music; they were trying to find some way to convey the silence, the beauty, the calmness, the soothingness that they had felt in meditation. They have worked in many ways; in fact all the arts have their origin in meditation, but music comes the closest, because music is nothing but a play between sound and silence.
To the ordinary musician the sound is important. To the master musician the silence is important: he uses sound only to create silence. He raises sound to a high pitch and then drops it so suddenly that you fall into a deep silence.
In the East the classical music is absolutely devoted to meditation. It has not forgotten its origin. But the origin must have been thousands of years back. There is no written record about it, so whatever I am saying is according to my inner experience. I have felt it, that I use language also in the same way... words to create moments of wordlessness. Basically it is the same technique.
So it is possible: listening to music you may remember me. You may feel close to me, although I am not a musician. There is no superficial connection between me and music, but there is something deeply connected.

The musician is using notes of music to create periods of silence.
I am using words to create gaps.
Those gaps are more real, closer to my experience than the words. But it is difficult for people to understand the gaps -- they can understand only words. So I have to trick them into the gaps. They come to listen to the words, but slowly, slowly they start slipping into the gaps. And finally they will find that they have been tricked: the words were irrelevant. What was really relevant was the gap between two words.
It has been a problem with the television people, because they have a limited time -- ten minutes, fifteen minutes at the most. And they have been asking me, "You speak so slowly, and you give so many gaps, that our fifteen minutes are just equal to five minutes. You speak only five minutes, and ten minutes is going into the gaps. Can't you speak more usually and not give so many gaps?"
And I had to tell them, "It is impossible, because my message is in the gaps. Words I can leave, and be silent; but gaps I cannot leave. Then there is no point in saying anything. What I am saying is those gaps; what you are listening to are the words."
So because I am using the same technique... not being a musician, I cannot play any instrument; there has not been time for me to learn to play any instrument. I have been involved so much with consciousness that whatever time was available to me, I have given to consciousness. So I am the most unskilled person. I cannot sculpt, I cannot write poetry, I cannot play music -- all that I can do is in some way create the same technique through words.

And that's why listening to music -- particularly classical music -- you may feel closer to me. You may feel very close. It does not matter what technique is used; the basis is the same.

All the arts have their origin in meditation, and all the arts have moved far away from meditation -- and this is a calamity. Otherwise every artist, whatever his special art, should find a way towards meditation. But it doesn't seem so.

On the contrary, most of the modern artists, musicians, dancers, poets, painters, sculptors, rather than reaching to meditation, end up in madness -- that is the other extreme of meditation. And the reason is because in the original sources the gaps were important, not the words. But as time passed words became more important than the gaps.

If you are going to print a book exactly the way I speak, it will become too lengthy and people will not be able to understand -- what is the matter, why so many gaps? So in printing you will have to bring the words closer and drop the gaps.

The same happened in music, the same happened in dancing. The dancer was trying to express his inner experience. He would go into a certain movement and then there would be a sudden stop, and he would become just like a statue. And that was the moment to understand. Gurdjieff had a group of disciples prepared for such a kind of dancing. He was giving a demonstration in New York. The people were in a frenzy, dancing, and Gurdjieff was standing by the side of the stage. Then suddenly he would say, "Stop!" And all the dancers would freeze immediately.

The frenzy, the movement was all gone: utter silence, not only in the dancers but in the audience too. And that was the message. At one point he brought all the dancers very close to the edge of the stage, and then he said, "Stop!" Now, stopping there meant falling from the stage. But no matter what, that was their training: they fell like statues, and those who were present could not believe what atmosphere it created. Their minds stopped working. Two dozen dancers simply falling as if they have become dead! No movement was allowed. As they are, they have to freeze exactly; then whatever happens -- whether they fall or not, even when they have fallen and the position is uncomfortable -- they are not to change it. They have to remain just the way they are.

And the people who were present reported that they had never seen such an immense impact on the audience -- not of the dance, but of the stoppings. And again Gurdjieff would say, "Begin!" And the whole frenzy would come back -- all the music and all the dancing. But he was trying to give to the people -- through dancing -- an experience of the gaps.

As far as I am concerned, it is absolutely on the right track that you are moving. You have found a way of being close to me.

Whenever you are silent, you are close to me.

Whenever your mind begins chattering, you start going away.

But modern music has fallen from grace because it has forgotten its basic purpose. It has forgotten its origin. It does not know that it has anything to do with meditation.

And the same is true about other arts. They have all become non-meditative, and they are all leading people to madness. The artist himself is creating a danger for himself and is also creating a danger for those who will be his audience. He may be a painter, but his painting is crazy; it has not come out of meditativeness.

You can see the modern sculpture -- it has lost all connections with its origin. The same is true about poetry. It is almost prose, it is no longer poetry. The difference between prose and poetry is becoming less and less. The difference was this: that prose was for mundane affairs, it had not come out of meditation. But poetry was not for mundane affairs.

In poetry there are jumps from one line to another, from one paragraph to another. In poetry nothing is said, but something is conveyed. You can only have a feel of it, you cannot get hold of it. The best poetry is almost uninterpretable.

One of the poems of Coleridge was part of some university syllabus. But the teacher could not figure it out, and he felt very embarrassed in front of the students. But he said, "There is nothing to be worried about. I know Coleridge, he is my neighbor. I will go to him tomorrow to ask exactly what he means, because I cannot figure out any meaning in this. It is beautiful poetry, but it has no meaning -- and without meaning what can I explain to you? I enjoy it, you can enjoy it, but there is nothing to be said about it. But then it cannot be in the university syllabus, where everything has to be explainable."

The next day he went to Coleridge, and he asked Coleridge, "Can you please explain the meaning of this poetry you

have written? I am embarrassed in front of my students because I cannot explain it."
Coleridge looked at the poem and said, "Yes, when I wrote it two persons knew what it meant; now, only one knows."
The teacher said, "Then certainly you must be the one."
He said, "No, I am not the one. When I wrote it I knew what it meant, and God knew what it meant. Now only God knows! You forgive me. I had written it -- it will be better to say that it has been written through me -- but I am not certain what it means. I love it, and once in a while I read it, I sing it, I remember it -- it is one of the best of my poems -- but don't ask about the meaning, because only one knows, and that is God.
"If you meet him ask him, because I am also feeling very embarrassed. You are not the first person to come; a few others have also come before with the same question -- and only about this poem."
And what he said is very significant: "When I wrote it two persons knew the meaning. Now only one knows, and that is God." And when somebody says, "Only God knows," it means nobody knows. "God" is just a substitute for "nobody."
The best painting will give you a glimpse of silence -- just looking at it, it will create some tranquility in you. But that is no longer true about modern painting. If you go on looking at a modern painting you will start feeling crazy, you will start feeling nauseous.
It is not a coincidence that a man like Jean Paul Sartre writes a novel called NAUSEA. The whole modern artistic world is suffering from nausea, and they are simply

throwing up, vomiting. Their paintings are their vomit, their poems are their vomit.

This was not the case with classical art. It was the most beautiful flowering of their beings that the artists offered. It was not nausea, it was fragrance. You could understand it, you could feel it, but you could not make it explainable. You could not hold it in your fist -- it was very slippery.

In the East it has been a tradition in all the arts, in philosophy, in religion, that great masters would discuss in the open, publicly, whatever they knew about. Great musicians would play their music in public -- that too was a debate. And it was really a very cultured phenomenon; there were no hard feelings. It was not a question of "me" winning -- defeating the other; the question was of deciding what the truth was. Whoever won or was defeated was irrelevant: truth should always win.

So the person who won the debate was accepted by the other with great reverence as his master. It was not enmity; it was gratefulness: "You made me aware that I was moving in a wrong direction." The same was true about musicians.

There is a famous story about Tansen. He was the musician in the court of Akbar. Akbar was very interested to have the best from all directions in his court -- the best musician, the best poet, the best philosopher, and so on and so forth. He had chosen Tansen, and Tansen was perhaps one of the greatest musicians the world has ever produced.

Akbar had given orders that where Tansen used to live, throughout the whole neighborhood, nobody could play music. It would be a disturbance to Tansen. Anybody playing music there would be put into jail, or he had to

accept a challenge and come to the court and face Tansen with his music.
So many people came and were defeated; Tansen had certainly something higher to give. But there was a man, Baiju Bawara. His name was Baiju; bawara means mad. People thought he was mad, so his full name became Baiju Bawara. His whole ambition was to come to a point where he could defeat Tansen -- he was a great musician himself. He worked hard for twenty-four hours a day. For the final touches he went to Haridas, the same man who was the teacher of Tansen. Haridas was very happy: "I never thought that another man like Tansen would ever be my disciple. But you have the quality. Just one thing is missing -- you have a desire to defeat somebody, and that is not very musical. That is making your being unmusical.
"You have beautiful instruments and you have beautiful art, but your heart is not in the music; it is in defeating somebody. And unless you drop that idea you will never be equal to Tansen. He has no idea to defeat anybody, that's why he goes on winning."

It was very difficult for Baiju Bawara to get rid of the desire, because that was the desire through which he had devoted his whole life to music. But if the master said so, then it was better to wait. He forgot all about Tansen, slowly slowly.
And once, when Haridas became very old, be became sick; and he had a kind of paralysis of the legs, so he could not go from his small cottage to the nearby Krishna temple. And without seeing Krishna, he would not eat anything.

Many physicians tried to treat him. They could not do anything. Baiju Bawara heard about it. He came running from his village, and he played early in the morning, when Haridas used to get up. The music that he played and the song that he sang means: "My eyes are thirsty to see you. Give strength to my legs; otherwise you will be responsible if I cannot see you. Don't leave me."

And Baiju Bawara sang with such beauty and played with such greatness that Haridas stood up, went to Krishna's temple where he was playing on the steps, and worshipped Krishna. Coming back, he told Baiju Bawara, "Now you can go and have a competition with Tansen. Now you don't have any desire of competition or winning. And if your music can heal my legs, you have got the master key."

But Baiju Bawara said, "What is the point? I have fallen in love with music. I have forgotten all about Tansen. It was a childish desire. And you were right -- I would have been defeated; and you are also right that today I would be victorious. But now there is no desire; I don't want to be a court musician. And the very idea is ugly, it is not part of a musical mind. You were right -- that kind of desire....

"Now music has become my meditation. It is not for competition. It is not to be victorious, to be famous. It is enough unto itself."

Haridas said, "Baiju, you are really bawara! You are really mad. Now is the point at which you can win." Baiju never went, but because Haridas himself had said, "This is the point at which you can win," it was absolutely certain that he had gone higher than Tansen. And in refusing to go in for a competition, he showed that now his music was not

part of the marketplace, it was something sacred. Now it had become his meditation.
If music moves rightly, it will take you to meditation.
So your experience is perfectly good. Let it happen more and more.

Question 4
BELOVED OSHO,
I HAVE BEEN AROUND YOU FOR SO MANY YEARS, AND ESPECIALLY THE LAST FOUR YEARS WERE SO BEAUTIFUL. TEARS OF JOY AND GRATEFULNESS FILL MY EYES. MY EYES SEE NO CHARM IN THE WORLD EXCEPT YOU. THERE WAS ONLY ONE DESIRE -- TO BE PHYSICALLY AROUND YOU -- AND IT IS STILL THERE, EVEN MORE THAN BEFORE. WHY IS IT SO?

It is natural; and it will be fulfilled.
There is no question about it.